DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 174 SP 006 965

AUTHOR McCampbell, James F.
TITLE Training in the Ford Training and Placement Program.
INSTITUTION Chicago Univ., Ill. Ford Training and Placement Program.
PUB DATE Jan 73
NOTE 83p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Masters Degrees; *Program Content; *Program Coordination; *Program Descriptions; *Program Design

ABSTRACT

This paper (chapter 7 of a larger monograph entitled "Training Teams of Teachers for Urban Schools: The Ford Training and Placement Program") discusses the three major stages of training in the Ford Training and Placement Program: a) specialist training and focused preparation, b) cadre training and coordinated preparation, and c) the intern year and the demonstration of interaction. The three sections include a critical analysis, suggestions for replication, brief histories on various aspects of the program, evaluations, and descriptions of the degree programs. (JB)

ED 083174

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NOV 28 1973

TRAINING TEAMS OF TEACHERS FOR URBAN SCHOOLS: THE FORD TRAINING AND PLACEMENT PROGRAM

"CHAPTER 7"

Henrietta S Schwartz
Director Ford Training &
Placement Program
University of Chicago
5835 Kimbark
Chicago, Illinois 60637

SP 006 965

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 083174

CHAPTER 7

TRAINING IN THE FORD TRAINING AND PLACEMENT PROGRAM

James F McCampbell

SP 006 965

INTRODUCTION. . . . . 1 & 2

STAGE I: SPECIALIST TRAINING AND FOCUSED PREPARATION . . 3

ROLE SPECIALIST TRAINING PROGRAMS 6

THE MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING AND
THE MASTER OF SCIENCE IN TEACHING PROGRAMS 14

CAUSE AND EFFECT. 22

STAGE II: CADRE TRAINING AND COORDINATED PREPARATION . . 24

HISTORY OF THE SUMMER TRAINING PROGRAM 25

THE SUMMER TRAINING PROGRAM 34

EVALUATION 63

STAGE III: THE INTERN YEAR AND THE DEMONSTRATION OF
INTERACTION 72

SETTINGS FOR TRAINING IN THE INTERNSHIP YEAR. . . . 73

ILLUSTRATIONS OF INTERACTION. 75

INADEQUACIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS. 77

CONCLUSION 79

preparation and group development. The primary authority was the program staff. In the third stage, the primary authority was the cadre. Their focus of attention was the interaction of all the parties as resources for the improvement of education at their school.

This chapter details the training in each of these three stages of the development of a cadre in the program in the first three major sections of the chapter. It then turns, in the fourth and final section of the chapter, to recommendations as to how the training that did in fact take place might be improved if the program were to be replicated.

STAGE I: SPECIALIST TRAINING AND FOCUSED PREPARATION

This section considers the first of the three stages of training. Its purpose is to identify the factors which influenced the responsiveness of University training programs to the requirements of the Ford Training and Placement Program.

Responsiveness to the requirements of the Ford Training and Placement Program were of course conditioned by the FTPP's request for a response. And the program did not request that entirely new training programs be instituted by the University. Although central city schools include the roles of special education, physical education, home economics, industrial arts, and counseling, there were no interns in these roles because the University did not have training programs for these roles, and there was no request on the part of the Ford Program for the University to develop such roles.

Should we have attempted to develop new degree programs for those roles represented in urban schools but not available at the University? To do so would have meant major reallocations of University resources far beyond the direct control of the program in time, talent, and finance. For example, to form a degree program in counseling would require the hiring of professors, the development of courses, the recruitment of students, and the formal approval of the Provost. But to do so would mean life-time support of the professor and a major change in the thrust of the sub-department of educational psychology. Since both of these are clearly far beyond the program's control, tenure, and finance, and since enough counselors seem to get adequate preparation without the resources of this University, no effort was made to develop such a degree program. The chief reason is that the University of Chicago cannot train enough people to affect the role of counselor. Instead, its philosophy is to concentrate on only a few roles and to concentrate on developing model programs so that its influence can be felt, not directly through a large number of graduates,

but rather through a few outstanding graduates who can attain influential positions and through training models that can influence other institutions. In terms of developing degree programs for other roles, then, the University was not responsive, nor was it called upon to be responsive.

Did the program take adequate advantage of the training programs which did, in fact, exist at the University? While generally we did, a more active search for cooperation might have improved our use of available programs. For example, the University includes a department of library science which includes both Master's and Ph.D. programs. We made no attempt to contact people within that department to explore possibilities of their graduates' being interested in taking roles in urban schools, nor did we investigate the possibilities of making contacts between that department and the schools with which the program cooperated. And it is certainly possible that such explorations might have had payoff for the training of librarians for urban schools. Now this example needs qualification in that there is an MAT program in library science in the Graduate School of Education and one of the students in that program was a member of one of the cadres. But, again, we made no major effort to investigate more extended possibilities.

In contrast, the School of Social Service Administration was contacted and did agree to involve its students in the cadre training model and to involve its faculty in the committee structure of the program. This example of aggressiveness on our part for seeking them out and responsiveness on their part for agreeing suggests that additional efforts in this direction might have had payoff for the program by involving other segments of the University and extending the number of roles which could be involved as interns in the program. But social workers were the only interns from a division of the University other than Education to be asked to become involved in the program. Our efforts to gain cooperation were limited essentially to programs already existing within Education.

Each of these already existing training programs is autonomous. They are not responsible to each other, and they are not responsible to the Ford Training and Placement Program. As chapter INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS has indicated, there were mechanisms established to bring these groups together, focus their attention on the Ford Program and the problems of urban education, and encourage them to adapt their programs to the Ford Program and urban education. But there was no way in which they could be forced to make appropriate changes. In each case, they faced the problem of continuing to give adequate preparation for basic competence in their special role (a task for which we all know that there is all too limited time and energy) while also responding to the special needs of those students preparing to be educators in the urban setting, and particularly through the vehicle of the Ford Training and Placement Program. The responsiveness of these programs to this call was, then, a real measure of autonomous response rather than a response to authority.

The Midwest Administration Center which trains administrators did not choose to participate in the Ford Program by including interns in the cadres. One obvious reason for this decision is that there is no possibility for the placement of administrative trainees in schools which already have a full administrative staff. But there was also a reticence on the part of the personnel in the Midwest Administration Center to see the Ford Program as an appropriate extension of their mission. Since then, they have instituted a training program for urban administrators, and this fact suggests that their failure to take an active part in the Ford Program was not an avoidance of the problems of the central city.

In nearly every case, then, the program relied on those programs available within the Education complex for cooperation in training program interns. And in nearly every case these training programs cooperated by responding to the needs of the Ford Training and Placement Program.

It is beyond the scope, purpose, and expertise of this monograph to describe and evaluate the six University training programs from which the FTP? drew its interns. Instead, this section will simply develop an argument about the factors which affected the responsiveness and the quality of the response to the needs of the Ford Training and Placement Program. The specialist training programs provided 28 of the total of 89 interns; since these training programs are treated in detail in chapter 8 , here we will only take isolated illustrations from these specialist training programs to develop the argument about the nature of the factors influencing the response to the Ford Training and Placement Program. Then we will apply these factors to a more detailed analysis of the training programs which provided the bulk of the interns for the Ford Training and Placement Program--the Master of Science in Teaching (MST) and Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) programs.

ROLE SPECIALIST TRAINING PROGRAMS

There is nothing sacred about the particular roles represented by the interns from these specialist training programs. Since they were selected from already operating degree programs, there were no interns in the common school roles of industrial arts teachers, coaches or counselors; but there were interns for the roles of adult educator, reading specialist, social-psychological specialist, and social worker--roles which are not common in schools. At another college or university, the particular set of roles included for internship would probably differ considerably.

Conceptualization

The basic conceptualization of these training programs remained essentially the same. Reading consultants continued to be trained in terms of diagnosis and remediation. Social workers continued to be trained as case workers, group workers, and community workers. Social-psychological specialists continued to

be trained in problem analysis and group process. Adult educators continued to be trained in the processes of surveying needs, defining resources, and developing programs. In none of these training programs were the basic conceptual structures of the field replaced by a division of central city and non-central city training. A near exception to this statement is the adult education program. When the Ford Program was initiated, the adult education program was organized only for the training of doctoral candidates primarily for placement in higher education positions; the program was not geared for practitioners and did not offer the Master's degree. In direct response to the Ford Training and Placement Program, the adult education program was revised to offer a Master's degree for practitioners, and the trainees who entered this Master's degree program were usually planning to join a Ford cadre. This program, then, was devised specifically to deal with the training of practitioners of adult education in the Chicago urban setting and was a major departure from the mission of the traditional adult education program.

Special Courses

Instead of changing the basic conceptualization of the training program for one based on central city/other dichotomy, each of these training programs formally incorporated the goals of the Ford Program in several ways.

They accepted specially developed courses which were developed and supervised under the joint authority of the Ford program and the training program. Two such courses were standard. One was for the analysis of group life and group development that took place in the cadres. The second was for the development of materials and procedures for working with the specific problems and tasks that the individual intern felt were important to him in working in his internship. Every training program was willing to include these two courses as parts of the training program. And each of the professors of each of the training programs was willing to adapt these courses to be mutually beneficial to the Ford Program

and to the specialist training program. As a consequence of this willingness, trainees often worked with both Ford staff people and specialist training professors on the development of ideas for these courses. That is, the advisory and credit system for these courses was often a mutual responsibility of program staff and specialist training program professors.

Availability of Options

A second important factor in these specialist programs' responsiveness was the kinds of options that students have available to them in determining their own client focus. In every training program there were major ways in which students could specialize their work by focusing on the central city--the selection of subject matter for papers to be written, the choice of topics within required seminars, the type of client selected for student practice experience, and the selection of unrequired courses.

This factor was particularly apparent in the newly formed adult education program leading to the Master's degree. In this program, special seminars were added to give the students the opportunity to discuss the kinds of problems that they would face in the central city and the kinds of action that they could take to overcome these problems. Since this seminar was attended by both students in their internship and students who had not yet begun their internship, clearly the seminar had a practical focus and provided for realistic response to the training program.

Specificity of Role Definition

Another factor which seems to have had a profound effect on the success of the specialized training was role definition. By role definition, I mean the definiteness with which the goals, the client group, the methods, the time line, and the procedures of the role could be spelled out and accepted by the trainer, the trainee, and the school faculty. In this respect, only two of the training programs experienced significant difficulty--the social-psychological

specialists and the adult educators. All of the other training programs represented traditional roles that were well-known to all groups which were in touch with the role--the trainers, the trainees, the Ford staff and the school staff. If a prospective intern went to a school to interview, and the principal asked him what he did, the reply of "English teacher" or "second grade teacher" was something that both the principal and the prospective teacher thought that they could understand. Certainly, there could be additional questions and the exploration of just exactly what that meant to the prospective intern. But the nature of the questions and the kinds of answers that might be given are all pretty well predictable and the conversation is easy with at least the impression of communication about something that both parties know about.

With the psychological specialists and the adult educators, this was not the case. Adult education is typically an activity that takes place in the evening where the adult educator trains adults who are interested in obtaining skills that they do not have--usually learning the language, learning to read, or studying for the citizenship examination. But in the Ford Program, these adult educators were to work as part of a cadre during the regular school day. What does that mean? All the rooms are already full; the adults are working. Who will the adult educator work with? What will he do? Where can he have an office? Does he need a phone? What's it all going to be about? What can we call him so that he can draw his paycheck? The same was true for the social-psychological specialist; additionally, this role had the added impediment of being inappropriately compared to the role of psychologist, which is common in the schools.

These two kinds of trainees, then, needed to be able to answer questions that were even more specific than those that the trainee in a traditional role would have to answer, because there was nothing that could be taken for granted. Yet these were exactly the trainees who had the fewest answers to give because,

since they and their trainers had had no experience with the role, they did not in fact know just exactly what the trainee would do or how he would go about it. These were questions that had to be answered from the practical experience of putting people in the school and finding out what they could do and what would be open to them.

This is not to say that these training programs were undertaken lightly or without forethought. The psychological specialist program was developed in response to careful thought about the problems of institutional problem-solving and communication, and methods that could be used to overcome those problems and thereby improve the functioning of the institution. The adult education program was founded on a vast knowledge base that has accumulated over a long period of years concerning the methods whereby an adult educator can identify community needs and develop a program which will begin to meet those needs. In neither case were the programs empty concepts. They were well-founded. But they were untried. And in the trying of the ideas they were in the position of not being able to predict exactly the problems that would emerge or exactly the course of action that would be the best response to the problems that emerged.

The trainees of these two programs, then, were the people most likely to be asked and least likely to be able to answer questions about their role. They had to face the difficulties of developing a definition of the role through the process of trying to fill that role.

At the same time, these programs and these trainees were the ones who were taking the most risk and who were, in a sense, being most responsive to the program's call for focused preparation. Both were focusing their attention specifically on the development of expertise for the inner-city school. Both were trying to develop new roles to fill defined needs in inner-city schools. But the difficulty of this task resulted in the trainees' being less able to define exactly what it was that they were about than were the trainees in the

other training programs. The fact that these programs had been particularly responsive to newly felt needs made them particularly susceptible to ambiguities about role definition, and consequently made their internship more trying.

The other side of the same coin is best represented by the programs for training social workers. There are three social worker training programs in the School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago--group social workers, case study social workers, and community social workers. The trainees in each of these programs can say very exactly what the distinctions are among the programs in both theory and practice. They know exactly the procedures they will use in identifying a client group, treating that client group, and reporting on the results of their treatment. In addition, the position of social worker is legitimated by the Chicago Board of Education certification procedures. There are area and district supervisors, and the lines of authority for social workers are clear.

Now in the case of social workers, very little was done to change the training program to account for the notion of focused preparation. The training program, in this sense, was unresponsive to the needs of the Ford Program. But because the trainees were confident of themselves in terms of the definition of their role, they experienced less difficulty in working in the cadres and in the cadre schools than did the trainees in the social-psychological specialist and adult education programs. Much the same case can be made for the reading specialists as has been made for the social workers.

Supervisory Personnel

A third important factor in determining the success of the specialized training programs in adapting to the call for preparation focused on the problems of urban schools was the availability of supervisory personnel to help the trainees in adapting to their jobs. Again, the various programs differed greatly in the kind of assistance which they gave their trainees during their internship. Social

worker trainees were supported by supervisors who were full-time members of the professional staff of the School of Social Service Administration. These supervisors had close knowledge of the students since they had worked with them as professors during the trainees' academic program. The supervisors had a limited and well-defined load of students to supervise, and they were trained in the particular specialty of the trainee--e.g., case work or group work. They visited their interns regularly, and held meetings with the trainee and the school principal to identify problems and dissatisfactions, and to develop methods of relieving them.

The adult education trainees were supervised by a person specifically hired by the adult education program for this task. Although the person who fulfilled this task was familiar with the program generally, he was not a regular member of the full-time University staff. Consequently, his efforts were somewhat less powerful since he did not have the same status as the social worker supervisors. He did, however, work regularly, consistently, and personally with all the adult education trainees.

The reading specialists received no regular supervision, although they did seem to feel free to call on the help of their instructors when they ran into problems.

Racial Awareness

Focused preparation was also influenced by the factor of racial awareness. Although the conceptual model of the program was focused only on deprived school communities, the fact was that every school that had a cadre was a Black school. The consequence of this fact was that awareness of the unique characteristics of the Black culture was particularly important to success in improving the education available in these schools. It was important that the trainers and trainees be aware of these factors and be prepared to take advantage of the opportunities the factors offered and be prepared to face and attempt to deal with

the problems that these factors might create for the cadre and for the individual trainees.

The more alert and aware the training programs were of these factors, the better they would be able to focus the preparation. One measure of their awareness was their attempt to recruit Black Students.

Table #1 below shows the percentage of Blacks in each special-list program for the two years prior to the program and for the four years during which the program placed three cadres.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF BLACKS IN SPECIALIST TRAINING PROGRAMS

	Total Blacks	Total Students	%of Blacks	Total Blacks	Total Students	%of Blacks
Adult Educator	1	71	1.4	11	116	9.5
Reading specialist	0	21	0.0	5	17	29.4
Social Psychological specialist	no program			18	41	43.9
Social Worker	19	175	11.0	170	700	24.3
	Program - 2 years prior to FTPP			4 years prior to FTPP		

These figures suggest responsiveness of these programs in two ways. First, the seeking out of Black students suggests a consciousness and sensitivity on the part of professors which must surely carry over into their conducting of their courses. Second, Blacks in the training programs become an internal source of pressure for the program to deal more fully and more adequately with the Black condition and central city problems.

We have, then a series of factors which seem important in the responsiveness of university training programs to the call of the Ford Program for preparation focused on central city problems. Now we will apply them to the two programs which furnished the majority fo the interns - the MAT and MST program AND THE MASTER OF SCIENCE IN TEACHING.

THE MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING PROGRAM

This section follows the organization of the previous section -- conceptualization, special courses, availability and use of options, specificity of role definition, supervisory personnel, and racial awareness as the major components of the responsiveness of training programs to the Ford Training and Placement Program.

The programs in the Graduate School of Education providing the pool from which the Ford Program chose interns were the Master of Science in Teaching (M.S.T.) geared to train pre-service elementary school teachers and the Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) for the training pre-service secondary school teachers. The Ford Program's association with M.A.T. program is described in great detail because twice as many interns were drawn from the secondary teacher training areas as from the elementary. The formation of two high school cadres and only one elementary cadre each year accounts for this ratio.

Additionally, the M.A.T. program was four to five times as large as the M.S.T. pre-service program which averaged about 20 students per year during the period 1967 through 1972. However, a brief discription of the M.S.T. pre-service elementary training program will be given, for it provided the interns for the three elementary cadres and the one middle school cadre.

The M.S.T. program featured a problem orientation, an emphasis on a strong liberal arts background and viewed the teacher as an instructional decision-maker. The degree sequence was built around a four quarter program requiring ten courses including theories of human behavior and curriculum design, language and reading, various methods course, classroom observations and student teaching. A master's paper "based on research and experimentation relevant to teaching in the elementary school,"[1] was the final component of the pre-service sequence.

Students in the M.S.T. program were informed of the FTPP early in the year and invited to apply for cadre membership. Ford staff persons screened applicants and selected six to eight interns for the elementary cadre each year. Typically, the last quarter of the MST degree sequence was the summer quarter, so MST students were completing master's papers while participating in the six-week FTPP summer training program.

Over the five years of Ford program operation, the focus of the MST program changed. For example, the "Announcements of the University of Chicago, The Department of Education and The Graduate School of Education, 1968-69" published November 30, 1967 (Volume LXVIII, No. 4) begins the description of the program with the following paragraph:

> This program of pre-service preparation for elementary teaching puts particular emphasis upon urban education. It is open to well-qualified college graduates, especially those whose study was in the liberal arts, who have the capacity and motivation for serious graduate study and an interest in teaching in an urban elementary school (page 45.)

---

[1]"Announcements: The University of Chicago, The Department of Education, The Graduate School of Education: 1971-73,"Volume LXXI, March 31, 1971, No.3 p.47.

In the Announcements - 1968-69" that sentence read, "relevant to teaching in the urban elementary school." (p 46)

In addition to changes in the faculty associated with the program, by March of 1971, the "Announcements" had no reference to urban education.

In changing the emphasis from an urban oriented program to a more general one, the faculty involved noted that the recruitment of Black students had been difficult and that white students in the program previously had difficulty in an inner-city school situation. Indeed, the FTPP discovered that the young white female intern typically recruited from the MST program did not stay in inner-city teaching much beyond the internship year. (See Chaper 9) But the Ford program staff also discovered that the experienced elementary school teachers in the cadre schools were eager for new knowledge and skills, benefited greatly from the curriculum work and micro-teaching sessions during the summer training program and tended to take what they learned during the summer back to their classrooms in the fall. It was the experienced teachers who solicited and welcomed university faculty visits to the school, requested their expertise and consultation and registered as Students At Large for additional course work during the year. This response from experienced teachers in addition to other factors prompted the director of the Ford Program to begin pressing for a degree program for experienced teachers beyond the very specialized two year reading consultant's program. When in 1971, the Graduate School of Education did offer a general degree program for experienced teachers (the MST-X Degree) eighteen of the FTPP experienced elementary school teachers of the total of 35 in the four cadres were accepted as degree candidates and completed their degrees during the 1971-73 period. Sixteen of the eighteen were Black.

The responses of faculty members in the MST program to FTPP have been positive and co-operative. They were intensively involved in the planning and operation of the summer training program and in the supervision of interns. Faculty members in the math and reading areas particularly were most generous in giving time to workshops at the cadre schools and in providing consultative services to the school/community as well as individual teachers. The problem was that the pool of pre-service interns from which the Ford program drew was young, white, female and highly mobile. Therefore, the intern component of the elementary school cadres tended to marry movable husbands and/or have stationery babies. Some responded to family pressure to leave a "dangerous" inner city school for suburban security. Some interns just could not survive the

culture shock, though intellectually they may have understood the conflict.

When the Ford Program began operation (in 1968), the MAT program was in the initial stages of changing from a two year program to a one year program. The two year program had consisted of a year of academic work and a year of 1/2 time paid internship, fully supervised by University professors, with the other 1/2 time spent in additional academic work, writing a Masters thesis, and preparation for teaching. The new program dropped the internship, and concentrated the program into five quarters (summer, academic year, summer) so that the academic standards were not decreased, and there was still time available for some student teaching.

The MAT program was conceptualized for liberal arts graduates without work in education. It included a full Masters program in the academic discipline a nd concentration on methods of teaching, with some work in education foundations. (The methods seminar is continuous over three quarters.) It is subdivided by academic disciplines with each subunit being governed by a group including the MAT professor in that discipline and representatives from that University department. This body determines the requirements within the discipline, while the MAT professors--both academic discipline specialists and foundations specialists--determine the education requirements.

From the inception of the FTPP to the present, many changes have occurred in the MAT program, and nearly all of them have been in the directions that were appropriate to the FTPP's call for focused preparation. Whether or not the Ford Program can be considered causal to these changes is a question that we will return to briefly at the end of this section. But many changes did occur, and the fact that they came from six different and relatively autonomous governing bodies which extended into many departments of the University suggests once again that these changes were autonomous responses rather than forced responses.

Conceptualization

While the basic conceptualization of the MAT program--intense subject area concentration, strong methods emphasis, and work in foundations of education-- did not change, the changes within this framework have been so major as to make the program extremely different from its configuration in 1968.

There was a decrease in the subject area concentration in some of the

subject matter areas. This was a direct result of the Ford Program, since the addition of the two courses especially formulated for the program would make an impossible course load leading to the degree. Take, for example, the secondary teacher training program for the training of teachers of English. Before the Ford Training and Placement Program appeared on the scene, students in the English MAT program were required to take at least six courses in the department of English, three required courses in the Graduate School of Education, the Masters comprehensive examinations in English, and the Masters paper under the joint supervision of the English Education professor and one English Professor. To reduce the requirements in Education required the approval of the Graduate School of Education. Reasonably, both of these groups were hesitant to do so. In the field of English, these students were already getting less course work than regular MA candidates. In education, they were trying to attain a reasonable degree of efficiency in teaching in the one year of a Masters degree program with students who had had liberal arts undergraduate educations without any specialization in education. Thus both faculty groups were feeling severely constrained by the number of courses available to them even before the Ford Program appeared on the scene. In response to this problem, some of the subject matter area governing bodies were willing to reduce the number of subject matter courses required so that Ford students could fit the specialized courses into their programs. Anyone who has worked at the interface between education programs and subject matter departments knows that this kind of change is a major accomplishment, and shows an unusual degree of responsiveness on the part of subject area people.

Another major change was the introduction of an entirely new degree program for experienced teachers. This degree program required only six courses in the subject matter area of concentration, and allowed the student to devote the other three courses required for the degree to a second area of concentration in education (e.g., inner-city sociology, administration). Only one methods course is required in this degree program. Here, then, was a real change in conceptualization that allowed the student to formulate an emphasis on central city education.

The third change in conceptualization of the MAT program was the change of emphasis that occurred in the methods work of the subject matter areas, particularly in the methods courses. In the social studies and history methods courses there

was a greater emphasis on the role of Black Americans and the study of misrepresentation and racism in secondary school text books. In English there was additional emphasis on developing Black studies curriculum and the study of Black authors as there was emphasis on reading problems of disadvantaged youngsters. In mathematics, the use of manipulatives became a more important part of the methods approach.

Special courses

The changes in the subject area requirements of the MAT program, and the development of the new degree program for experienced teachers both allowed for the inclusion of special courses in inner-city education, including those specifically designed for the Ford Training and Placement Program.

Availability of Options

One aspect of the MAT program is a mini-course component. Persons are asked to submit plans for a mini-course on any subject defining the objectives, materials, methods, and number of hours. All the plans submitted are evaluated and then offered. The students in the program must take a total number of hours of these "elective" mini-courses to add up to a full course of credit. This arrangement obviously offers great program flexibility and various members of the Ford Program staff offered special mini-courses on aspects of teaching in the inner-city. This option allowed students to begin to explore problems of teaching in the inner-city if they were of such a mind.

The student teaching component of the program also offers a variety of opportunities to the students. In most subject matter areas, the students student-teach twice during their year of graduate study. Since the students can opt to do their student teaching in the kind of setting that they are interested in for a career, it is possible in this aspect of the program for a student to gain some experience working with inner-city pupils. Also, the methods instruction offered considerable freedom for students to choose the kind of emphasis they wished in developing materials and teaching techniques. With the addition of experienced teachers to these courses, additional interaction between experienced and inexperienced was possible. Also, the experienced teachers were a force for the consideration of practical problems of teaching in the inner-city schools of Chicago, and brought to the methods course a

greater emphasis on inner-city curriculum.

Finally, the program requires a Masters paper which has considerable flexibility built into it. The student may opt to make the paper an investigation of a problem in his subject matter area or a more general problem of teaching. He may focus on the theoretical or the practical. He may also deal with the problems of teaching in the inner-city. Consequently, in this option also students have the opportunity to explore a problem which is focused on the inner-city.

In all three of these components of the program, students in the secondary teacher education program have the opportunity to focus their preparation on the particular kind of school in which they wish to teach--whether it be inner-city, suburban, rural, or what have you.

Specificity of Role Definition

Since the role of science teacher, art teacher, etc. are traditional roles in the schools with a defined client group, a defined place to work, defined methods, etc., these teacher trainees experienced little difficulty with role definition in their work.

The previous discussion of this concept of role definition has implied an interesting distinction between traditionally defined roles and new roles. When roles are well defined, the task of the intern is much less difficult because he can have confidence in knowing what to do. But if he already knows what to do, this implies that there are no problems that he must face in re-defining his role. It is possible, then, that the intern whose role is well defined is gaining his confidence and ability to operate with relatively little difficulty at the expense of considering and doing something about the inadequacies of the way the role functions. If we perform in the traditional ways, we may be overlooking the real problems and be; in fact, contributing to them. If we operate in innovative ways, the task is much more difficult, and we have no guarantee that the difficulty will be offset by solution of problems. Either course--well defined specific roles or ill-defined vague roles--then, has its advantages and difficulties.

Supervisory personnel

Since the MAT program was undergoing a change from a two year program which included one year for half time supervised intern teaching to a one year program

that did not include an internship, the program was moving in exactly the opposite direction from the Ford Program's need for a supervised internship. Needless to say, these two conflicting directions created problems. The call for supervised internship being made by the Ford Training and Placement Program was a demand for time and energy beyond the definition of the roles of the education professors, just at a time when their energies were strongly devoted to the revision of their own programs to accomplish in five quarters what they had previously had seven quarters to do.

The professors' response to this demand was heartening in that all of them devoted much time and energy to the supervision of Ford interns when this supervision was not a part of their program. But they also requested assistance in this task. The Ford Program provided this assistance in the form of monies to support additional supervisory personnel, who were then used by the professors to fill in the gaps that they were not able to take care of themselves. In different subject matter programs this assistance took different forms. For example, in history, the assistant became an integral part of the entire program assisting in all areas of the professor's work--teaching methods, advising students, and directing MAT thesis as well as supervising Ford interns. In mathematics, the assistant devoted full time to work in the schools where Ford had cadres, assisting the entire department of mathematics in its teaching and curriculum development, but did not participate in other areas of the program.

Racial Awareness

The same pattern of change is evident in the MAT program (Table #2) as in the other program (Table #1, p. 13-14) in terms of racial balance. As with the other programs, this increase in Black students is evidence of a consciousness and sensitivity on the part of the program staff, and the Black students became an internal source of pressure for more adequate attention to the Black condition and central city problems.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE OF BLACK STUDENTS IN THE MAT PROGRAM

TWO YEARS PRIOR TO FTPP			FOUR YEARS OF FTPP		
total Blacks	total Students	%of Blacks	total Blacks	total Students	%of Blacks
1	313	.3	41	551	7.4

CAUSE AND EFFECT

Can the Ford Training and Placement Program be considered the cause of the responsiveness of these training programs to the special needs of students who will be working in the inner-city schools? Certainly as an internal stimulus, the Ford Training and Placement Program was the cause of change within the Education complex of the University of Chicago. But there were many external factors which were probably also causal. For example, at the time when the program was formulated, Martin Luther King, Jr. was alive, and the civil rights movement was reaching toward its peak. There was considerable federal money available for improvement of education within the inner-city schools of large metropolitan areas. In the field of education, improvement of inner-city education was the thing to do (just as competancy and performance based teacher education was the thing to do in 1972 and 1973). The University of Chicago was being called upon by community groups and by its student body to be more "relevant"--to be more responsive to the needs of the urban community in which it is located. So there were many sources of pressure and many reasons for being more sensitive to the problems of urban education in the early days of the Ford Program. Within this framework, the Ford Training and Placement Program was a manifestation of these concerns. As it was manifest, it became a further cause to greater responsiveness. But many of the things which changed within the training programs may have happened even if the Ford Program had not been in existence.

One bit of evidence supports this conclusion. The Ford Program was housed in the education complex and clearly exerted influence upon that complex. But its influence upon the School of Social Service Administration was minimal. Although over the course of the program there were at least six SSA professors closely related to the Ford Program, none of them were in positions which had a significant effect upon student recruitment efforts. Yet note that in Table #1 SSA shows the same increase in percentage of Black students as do those programs which were housed in the education complex.

It seems, then, that the appropriate logic is that there were a variety of conditions prevalent throughout our country at the time of the Ford Program's inception and following that led post secondary educational institutions to be responsive to the problems of the inner-city. That responsiveness manifested

itself, at least in part, in the Ford Training and Placement Program. Once manifest, the Ford Program became in turn a further force to cause greater responsiveness to the problems of urban education.

In response to these forces, the training programs which trained the students who became interns in the Ford Program were responsive to the call for preparation focused on the problems of the inner-city. Although these responses were quite varied from program to program, this section has developed a set of characteristics which seem to be particularly important in looking at that responsiveness. There has been no attempt to evaluate any program, since such a task is far beyond the aim of this monograph and the expertise of the writer. But it seem possible, from the argument developed, to know what to encourage to help traditional training programs to be responsive to a new condition.

1. The College or University should be searched for programs which bear on the goals of training. The faculties of these related programs should be encouraged to become familiar with the conceptualization of the program and to join in the executive administration of the program.
2. University training programs which are willing to participate in the special effort should be encouraged to revise their basic conceptualization to focus it specifically on the target population. They should be encouraged to loosen their requirements as much as possible to allow for the specialization necessary for the training program.
3. They should be encouraged to develop special courses in collaboration with the program staff, courses which would be an integral part of both the specialist training program and the cadre program, and they should share in the development, teaching, and evaluation of the courses.
4. They should be encourage to guide students in the options available within their courses, and to increase the number and kind of those options.
5. They should spend considerable time working with the program staff and their students on the delimma of role definition -- the value of clear definition and its attendant confidence, and the advantage of willingness to change role definition to fit the circumstances.
6. They should be supported in their efforts to provide high quality, regular, intensive supervision in the field.
7. They should be encouraged to learn about and respond to the unique characteristics of the population which the cadre program serves.

STAGE II: CADRE TRAINING AND COORDINATED PREPARATION

The second of the three major stages of training took place in the summer following the academic training and prior to the internship.

For cadre training, the Ford Training and Placement Program staff developed a specialized program which focused on the goals of coordinated preparation and group development. This program was an intense six week summer program that immediately followed the intern's year of academic study. Since the program evolved over the four summers that the program was in operation, and since that evolution included some rather disasterous mistakes, this section will first deal briefly with the history of the development of the summer training program. Following the brief historical account, is rather complete detailing of the summer program as it occurred during the last summer of full operation of the program. Finally, there is an evaluation of the weaknesses and strengths of the summer program, and recommendations for replication.

We can summarize and foreshadow the development of the summer training program with Table #3 below. The scale represents the division of the acitivities of each summer program, with a unit in the scale having the value of 1/2 a week in the summer program. Consequently, each summer program has a total value of 12 since each of the summer programs was six weeks in length. Over the course of the four summer programs, there was great change in the nature of the activities and in the titles that were given the. Consequently the table is only a rough generalization of what was going on. It serves only the purpose of a general introduction the development of the summer training program. The most general statement that emerges is that work at role skills and curriculum gradually decreased while work on the cadre group process increased. The cross-role training was overlooked until the final summer program during which it became

TABLE 3

TIME IN SUMMER PROGRAM DEVOTED TO DIFFERENT SUBJECTS, 1=1/2 WEEK

	Skills in the role	Curriculum planning and development	Black experience	Cadre group process	Cross-roles training	Program explanation
1968	2	5	4	0	1	0
1969	4	2	3	3	0	0
1970	2	2	3	4	0	1
1971	0	1	1	5	4	1

a major part of the program. The Black experience played a major role in the summer program until the last summer during which it was considerably reduced in emphasis. The final summer program emphasized cadre group process and cross role training rather than large scale Black community involvement, and curriculum and role improvement.

HISTORY OF THE SUMMER TRAINING PROGRAM

Summer, 1968

The first summer training program was divided into two major sections -- the cross role seminar and curriculum -- which became the titles for the two special courses that were offered by the Ford program throughout its life. The cross role seminar was held during the first two and one half days of each week and included four major components -- microteaching, the saturation study, study of roles, and cadre meeting. The micro-teaching segment was held at one of the cadre schools, and the sessions were done with students from that school and elementary students from the same neighborhood. The saturation study was designed to develop a close working knowledge of the nature of the community on the part of cadre members. They were to go out into the community to discover the nature of problems there and to become familiar with the organizations and agencies that were operating in the community. A large number of community persons participated with the cadre to accomplish this task (approximately seven adults and four students were included in the "extended" cadre). The seminars were used either for meetings of the cadres under the direction of the trainer for each group, or were used for specific inputs planned by the cross-role committee.

The curriculum component of the program had two major subdivisions. First, the entire group (including all three extended cadres and the University methods professors) met to discuss the problems of teaching and curriculum development in the inner city. Second, groups met according to subject matter (at the secondary level) or grade level (for the elementary cadre) to develop curriculum for the ensuing year.

The major portion of the first week of the six week program was devoted to introducing the various kinds of activities that would take place throughout the summer. The entire last week of the program was devoted to sessions on evaluation of the summer program. Consequently, nearly two weeks of the total of six were not used for instruction.

A host of factors worked to decrease the effectiveness of this summer

training program. At the most general level, the fact that the entire organization was new meant that everyone had to learn as he was doing just how to do. This factor mitigated against effective training within each specific subdivision of the program and at the level of coordination among the various subdivisions of the program. Since the program was striving for a high level of involvement from widely diverse groups, the problems of putting the whole thing together as an effective program became almost overwhelming. Also, there was a failure to centralize responsibility by making individuals responsible for particular program segments and that group of individuals respnsible to some one person for the overall coordination of the program. For example, there were four active committees operating at this time -- the executive committee, the cross role committee, the curriculum committee, and the evaluation committee. On one occasion, three of these committees had meetings at exactly the same time, without knowledge of the meetings of the other groups. These failures of general organization and coordination of responsibilities exacerbated the problems that arose within each of the segments of the summer program.

Those sections of the summer program were strongest in which the individuals in charge had a clear sense of direction and purpose from prior experience with the same kinds of training activities.

Micro teaching was directed by one of the originators of the concept. Hence, it was well planned and able to operate in the kind of concise manner that gives confidence and satisfaction to students and teacher alike. Unfortunately, an adequate micro-teaching clinic depends upon very close scheduling. But students sometimes failed to show up, teachers sometimes failed to show up, and equipment occasionally broke down (and there was no extra equipment.), So these sessions were in part frustrated by these kinds of administrative problems.

The cadre trainers knew what they were about because of their previous training and experience with group sensitivity training. But again, they were at least partly frustrated by being at the scheduling whim of the cross-role committee. The committee used cadre meetings essentially as filler for the time periods in which the committee did not have activities planned for the cadre groups. This meant that the group trainers could not rely on a regular schedule, and they might be called upon to fill a time period for which they were not prepared, or might be called upon to give up a time period that had not only prepared for themselves, but had also gotten the cadre "up"? for. Also,

there were personnel problems. One of the trainers was the director of the program; this led to confusion about his role and confusion about the kinds of interactions that were appropriate between himself and the cadre. A second trainer was not available until the third week of the program, so in this cadre there was a change in personnel that was disruptive. The third trainer was a university professor, and this again caused problems of role clarity.

The subject matter curriculum sessions were also in the hands of highly experienced people -- the methods professors. Since their sessions were with a small group of people, many of whom they had known before, they were much better able to adapt to scheduling difficulties, and continue to develop in a more informal atmosphere of a small intimate group. Nevertheless, they were also disadvantaged by schedule intrusions from the other segments of the program.

The above segments -- micro teaching, cadre training, and subject matter curriculum development -- were the ones for which the trainers were best prepared, and even they had serious difficulties. The other three segments -- cross-role seminars, saturation study, and curriculum seminars -- were even more difficult.

The cross-role seminars were directed by a committee which was unable to set specific goals and plan a program to meet those goals before the summer program started. The consequences was an ad hoc program which was directed to responding to problems that developed as the summer program evolved, or isolated sessions directed by individuals who were willing to present ideas that came from their specific interests. There was very little continuity to the program.

The saturation study and the curriculum seminars were both victims of the hostility and conflict that developed between community persons and other program participants. The atmosphere was one of recrimination and defensiveness which no one knew how to turn in directly and immediately productive directions. The result was not an immediate and positive response in terms of developing curriculum or developing understanding between program participants and community representatives. Instead, the result was withdrawal on the part of both sides and a failure to make direct improvements in the understanding of educators and the education of children.

All in all, the program was disasterous. It not only failed in its immediate goals of improving the training of educators. It also resulted in an

atmosphere of frustration, attitudes of hostility, and the withdrawal of people from cooperation with the program, university people, community people, and trainees, alike. It did damage to the spirit of cooperation that was necessary to the success of the program, and created difficulties in relationships that took a long period of time to mend.

Within this rather dismal general atmosphere, there were, of course, individuals and groups who were able to accomplish much.

And in addition, the atmoshphere itself, though depressing and frustrating, may have been a necessary and valuable first step in the development of the program. Recall that this program occurred in the summer of 1968 in Chicago, Martin Luther King Jr. had been assassinated the previous spring. There had been riots in several cities, and the mayor of Chicago had issued a directive to "shoot on sight". That summer witnessed the trauma of the Democratic convention riots. The atmosphere was stormy, and the summer training program reflected many of the concerns that were being voiced at a national level in actions and reactions that were much more difficult than the frustrations of a small teacher training program.

Forces as powerful as the ones loosed by, or represented by, the dramatic and traumatic events that were taking place within our country at the time were having there effect upon the summer training program. It is difficult to tell if, in the long run, the results were constructive or destructive. But they did have their effect.

Change is always difficult. In retrospect, it seems obvious that trying entirely new modes of training, inviting participation of remarkably different groups of people would be a process fraught with difficulty and subject to considerable searching of wrong directions before it could stabalize in directions that are obviously and directly productive. Asking these individuals to cooperate on tasks involving curriculum revision and change was bound to produce tension and create personal and professional conflicts. But the idea of change itself was relatively new. At the time of the first summer program, the participants did not even have the experience of the difficulty of the unexplored, and were not prepared to face with equanimity or, at least, forebearance, the difficulties of the processes. What, then, in retrospect may have been a necessary muddling in unknown waters was at the time an unanticipated and unacceptable lack of immediate accomplishment. What may have been a necessary stage

in evolution of new ideas was viewed at the time as, essentially, a disaster.

Summer, 1969

The general atmosphere of the country did not change greatly during the 1968-1969 school year; neither did the atmosphere of the Ford Training and Placement Program. Community persons continued to be hostile toward university people, school personnel were hostile toward cadre members, and the program continued to have a diffuseness and lack of direction with many committees making suggestions in many directions, but much of the labor not getting done. In the spring of 1969 the program director resigned and an acting director was appointed. (For a more detailed explanation and analysis of this set of events see Chapter 4 PP._____ through ____). At this point in time, school communities were not only hostile toward the university; they were leary specifically of the Ford Training and Placement Program. Also, many students were suspicious of the program and were not willing to make a commitment to it by becoming interns. As the summer 1969 approached, then, the program was being operated by an acting director, schools were not willing to participate, and students were not willing to become members of cadres.

Because of these circumstance, the 1969 summer program began with the following unusual circumstances. One high school cadre was made up entirely of Blacks. The second high school cadre did not yet have a school to go to; consequently it was made up only of interns. A new program director had just been chosen but was not yet employed. Each cadre was to have a cadre liaison, but only the elementary liaison had been chosen; the two high school cadre liaisons had not yet been selected. Only two members of the Ford staff had participated in the previous summer program.

The program was planned by the Ford Program staff and the coordinating committee (see Chapter 3) and a particular individual was responsible for each segment, so that much of the problems of responsibility and coordination that had existed in the previous program were overcome.

The program was divided into five major segments: In "The Learner and Society" a series of lectures and discussions dealt with the nature of students in urban schools, the nature of their heritage, and the nature of the social system of the city, the school system, and the school. A skills segment presented particular skills to teachers and had them develop those skills by pract-

-ice. A practicum afforded the opportunity to practice skills from the skill session in a microteaching format. Curriculum development was again pursued under the direction of the methods professors. Finally, in the segment called cadre planning, the cadres began to plan their activities for the coming school year.

At the beginning of the summer program, the participants were given the following description of the summer program.

JUST EXACTLY WHAT DOES A CADRE DO?

1. It provides a forum for its members to help each other with both moral and practical support. Here's an example:

An English teacher says, " My fifth period essentials are really a mixed group. Some are conscientious students but just slow to learn. Some are really bright but they just sit and don't do anything or they sleep. Some can't sit still; they seem to have real emotional problems. I don't know what to do with them." A counsellor asks for the names of some of the kids and works with the teacher on those cases. A science teacher mentions how he has succeeded with those same kids. The principal visits and points out the many good things the teacher is already doing. The cadre liaison works with the department head and the University coordinator to suggest curricular material that might be helpful. The librarian interviews three of the students and gets them involved in reading programs.

2. When the members of the cadre are comfortable with each other and confident that they can work well together, they begin to develop projects. For example, out of the illustration above might come an English curriculum project involving the entire English department. After discussing the problem, members of the cadre might ask other staff members to join them in a study of the problem of regular attendance. The cadre might develop a proposal for a mini-grant for a summer school for essentials students.

3. As the cadre reaches out to involve other members of the staff, they perform services to the entire professional staff.

HOW DOES THIS SUMMER PROGRAM FIT IN?

In reviewing what's been said above, you might pick out three important ways that the program will help each professional educator become more successful: by creating greater understanding of the particular setting in which he works,

by improving the individual's skills, and by creating a group whose members can help each other. The summer program is designed to reach these objective in the following ways:

1. UNDERSTANDING THE SETTING -- The Learner and the System.
   Black history and Black culture provide a broad general background. Systems analysis shows how the educational system fits with other systems and how the parts of the educational system fit together. Educational psychology suggest ways the individual learner should be dealt with in this context of the culture and the system. This section of the summer program narrows from the culture to the individual learner so that you can plan more intelligently.
2. IMPROVING SKILLS -- Curriculum
   Working as a subject matter or grade level group, you will be able to discuss major questions about how curriculum should be structured and what the best trends are in your area, and you should be able to develop particular curriculum materials to use with students next year. This section should grow from the knowledge you have developed in the section on the learner and the system.
3. IMPROVING SKILLS -- Skills instruction and micro-teaching
   Skills instruction will present information on a variety of approaches to classroom planning that you will use to develop lesson plans which you will try out with students.
   Micro-teaching will give you an opportunity to practice important teaching skills with students so that you can improve your instructional techniques. Both of these should fit with the knowledge and plans that you have developed in the section on the learner and the section on curriculum. This section should help you put together the knowledge, the plans, and develop the skills to apply the knowledge and the plans.
4. CREATING A GROUP -- Cadre planning
   The group will get to know each other, discuss how the information and skills developed in the other sections are applicable to their school, learn about the particular problems of their school, and begin to plan their activities for the coming year. Since each cadre will have different problems, the mornings of the last week of the program have been left open for the cadres

to plan in the way that will be most beneficial to them.

Comparison

The 1969 summer program was a retrenchment and a retreat from the traumatic experiences of the previous summer. The "saturation study" which had been envisioned as an action oriented field study of the nature of the community was replaced by " the learner and society" which was a classroom based series of lectures and discussions by experts, one at a time. The curriculum seminars which had been open forums including a large number of students and adults from the community were given up, and the curriculum work focused on the teachers working only with each other and the university professors on the development of curriculum materials for the coming year. Cross role training was replaced by the skills segment which focused on the individual teacher in the classroom rather than the interaction of groups across roles in the school setting. Micro teaching remained but took place at the University rather than in one of the neighboring schools. Cadre meetings, which had been essentially filler the previous summer, became a regularly scheduled part of the program.

This retrenchment was valuable in that it allowed for the semblance of order, direction, and achievement that were important in light of the frustration that had resulted from the previous summer program. Also, in a minor way, the emphasis on cadre planning began to move the training toward the specifics of the people in training and their working together. With the inclusion of the role of liaison, and with the selection of trainers who stayed with program for three years, this segment became the basis for more and more sophisticated and responsible work with the development of the cadres that took place in the following summers.

But the retrenchment was also a disappointment in that it gave up training thrusts that were basic to the conceptualization of the program. The withdrawal vis a vis community certainly reduced the aspect of "focused preparation" and the withdrawal of the cross role training segment certainly reduced the aspect of "coordinated preparation." Grappling with the realities of training in a very difficult social milieu and in areas new to the trainers was having major effects on the shape of the program

Summer, 1970

The 1970 summer program followed the pattern that had been established in the 1969 summer program. But four minor changes became parts of the model for the summer program to come.

First, there was a period of two days taken at the beginning of the program to as carefully as possible define the goals of the Ford Training and Placement Program, the goals of the summer program, and the expectations of the program for the participants. This segment was an important step in moving toward a definition of task that was shared by everyone an integration of activities that made the summer training begin in real ways to take on the characteristics of a training program.

Second, the program held a three day residential retreat directed by the group process consultants. This retreat furthered the development of shared objectives and integrated activities. It also introduced the participants to the problems that would confront them. One of those problems was the racial issue. The second was the problem of any group working together as a group.

Third, the "learner in the social system" specifically addressed the problem of developing a model of the kinds of characteristics that could be expected of the students in the cadre schools. While this issue had been on the fringes of conscious planning in the previous summer programs, the direct attempt to develop a model was a step that had not occurred previously and did not occur again in the following summer program. We will return to this issue of developing a model at a later point in this chapter.

The fourth change was the introduction of research and evaluation activities directed specifically at the evaluation of the summer program. Such instrumentation and reporting was extensive, and it was on the basis of the reports that issued from this effort that the final summer program of 1971 was changed extensively from the model that had prevailed in 1969 and 1970.

Otherwise, the program was essentially the same as it had been the previous year. The major segments were titled "The learner in the social system" "Cadre Planning,""microteaching", and "curriculum development."

Summer, 1971

The 1971 program relied heavily on the research and evaluation reports of the previous summer to make major revisions of the nature of instruction. Also, the planning was begun far in advance (during September of 1970) and was pursued as a major goal by the total staff of the Ford Program. Consequently, the 1971 program was better adjusted to the conceptual model than previous summer programs had been; it was more carefully developed and fully planned for;

and it was much more successful in achieving the goals of the program. Consequently, it is described in detail in the next section of this chapter.

THE SUMMER TRAINING PROGRAM

The background out of which the final summer program grew had been developed in the previous section. Now we turn to a detailed account of this second major stage of training--the summer training program. After giving a brief overview of the program, we will consider each of its parts in detail--Black perspectives, goals and process, crossrole training, competency, and group development.

Overview

In planning for the 1971 summer program, the Ford Training and Placement Program staff prepared a document which included the following statement.

> The summer program of the Ford Training and Placement Program, as the initial experience for training and placing teachers and role specialists in a particular school, must be considered the most successful operation of those participants in the schools. As a training experience, it should prepare participants to function selectively in cadres (work groups)when they are placed in the schcols and give necessary support to neophytes, in addition to upgrading the competence of participants as they gain a better understanding of their role and others' roles and share that knowledge.
>
> Some continuing problems related to past summer programs have already been identified, but four are particularly apparent. 1) One of these is the failure of the program to spell out just what is involved in a particular role (norms and expectations, skills, knowledges). 2) Another problem is the failure of the program to address itself to the major problem involved in acquisition of roles, vis-a-vis individual personalities. 3) Still another problem is the failure of the program to point out to participants those conditions in a social system which affect "discrepancies between the expectations of those who assume the role and the expectations of others concerned. . . . ."4) Finally, the program has failed to systematically help program participants take on their roles by recognition of distinct roles, involvement of those roles in the development of the training program, utilization of these roles in the summer programs (with a view towards functioning similarly in an actual school setting), emphasizing these roles by allowing for intra-role exchanges apart from other roles, and further development of these roles, through the medium of the cadre, after the participants enter the actual school setting. 1

Subgroups of staff were then established to detail the plans for each of the major components of the program. When the subgroups had a tentative outline, they interviewed participants from previous summer programs and prospective participants. On the basis of the suggestions, they revised. Intermittently, each subgroup reported back to the total staff and again had their plans revised. Professors in the training programs also made suggestions.

1. " FTPP Staff Evaluation of Summer Programs", November, 1970, mimeo, p.4.

The entire plan was put together in a package and individuals were assigned responsibility for each segment.

The final abstract for the program read as follows.

The summer program is designed to provide learning experiences for participants which will enable them to:

1. better understand the goals of the program
2. percieve the cadre as the operating mechanism of the program;
3. better understand the various roles in the cadre and the resources of role incumbents. In fact, the central notion that pervades the entire summer program is that of cross-role training which involves explicating the various roles and understanding their interrelationships.

The preliminary planning and scheduling was developed by the FTPP staff. Each staff member worked on the particular component(e.g.,experienced teacher) in which he had the most knowledge. We realize that our predictions of your interests and desires may be incorrect. Consequently, we ask you to make the revisions that you feel are appropriate in the component for which you will be responsible. The process of revision and planning for your presentations will begin at the meeting on Saturday, June 19. Each participant will be a member of a group responsible for a component of the summer program which will explain the nature of the role, its problems, the necessary competencies,and its relationship to the social system of the school and the cadre. Likewise, each participant will be responsible for the learnings presented by the other groups. The groups are:

1. experienced teacher,
2. intern,
3. role specialist,
4. community representative,
5. administrator,

In addition to the components which are the responsibility of participants, there are three other components of the program. The FTPP staff has planned the general orientation component which includes the two pre-summer meetings and the first two days of the summer program. The group process consultants have planned a retreat which will take the remainder of the first week of the summer program. The MAT, MST, and other specialty advisors will plan in collaboration with participants the competency sessions which will focus on the development and improvement of curriculum and classroom competence. The schedule of the summer program will show you how these components will fit together.

The summer training program was divided into five segments -- Black perspectives, goals and process, cross-role training, role competency, and group development. The chart below shows how they fit together.[1] See page 36

---

1. "The FTPP Summer Program - 1971", May, 1971, mimeo, p.1.

Week One

Weeks Two--Six

	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F
9:00		Black		Goals		Role	Cross-Role training			
11:30				and						
12:30	L U N C H						L U N C H			
3:00	Perspective Process					Compe-tence	Group Development			

Black Perspectives

The context of the program -- its goals and methods of operation-- was developed from the time of the first contact between the school and the program. In general presentations to the staff, and in individual interviews with interested teachers, the Ford Program emphasized what it expected to do and what it did not expect to do. But this process was continued formally after all of the participants had been chosen. People from the schools and from the training programs met each other in a series of meetings which were held prior to the summer program. In these meetings, the goals and methods of the program were reviewed, and participants were invited to change the structure of the summer program and to begin to plan for the segment of the summer program that they would be responsible for. In these meetings, people were told clearly what the limitations of the program were and what the goals of the program were so that, after meeting they would have a final opportunity to withdraw or make a commitment.

The context of this program is black. The students bodies of participating schools are over 95% black, the majority of the experienced teachers are black; the majority of the staff is black; many of the interns are black. The six-week summer training program began with a segment devoted to "The Black Perspective."

In this segment, local authorities presented their views on the set of problems that are unique to Black Americans today. This program segment had three major results.

First, Whites in the program had a very powerful learning experience. They were exposed--many for the first time--to first hand contact with a perspective which was unfamiliar to them. They were often alarmed at the conditions which prevail; they were sometimes surprised with the perspective with which Blacks view the conditions; they were often shocked by the frustration and anger which accompany the perspectives; and they were consistently challenged by being viewed as part of the problem rather than part of the solution. This program segment took the first step in introducing White cadre members to the feelings and perspectives of the culture in which they would be working.

Second, for all program participants, the segment assisted in conceptualizing a most complex set of problems, The benefit of articulate contemplative students of the Black condition was to provide a framework in which participants could formulate and understand the problems. A set of principles, a diagram, a theoretical model, an exemplary incident, a poetic cry--all aided in deepening awareness, illuminating causes and consequence, increasing sensitivity, and gaining insight. The tools that were offered in this segment are ones that were referred to and used during the ensuing six weeks as individuals and cadres attempted to understand and begin to gain control over the situations in which they would work.

Third, the "Black Perspective" reemphasized the need for self-direction and personal motivation in attacking problems. When Dr. Charles Hurst, President of Malcom X College, had concluded a moving portrayal of the problems of Black education embedded in the racial problems of our entire society, one of the program participants pleaded,"But Mr. Hurst, what can we do?" His answer was not in terms of federal finance or conceptual models or radical program. Rather his answer was in terms of individual integrity and commitment which gives the courage to persevere in the face of impossible circumstances.[1] Models, principles, and perspectives are after all, only the beginning of solutions. The cadre approach puts its faith in people, and this program segment served to remphasize that faith.

Formal presentations were only a small part of the program segment. Ideas

---

1. see e.g. Charles G. Hurst, "Black Focus," Daily Defender, Chicago, June 17, 1970.

were also gathered from selected readings. But another important aspect of this segment was the interaction that followed from the ideas. Typically, this interaction happened in three settings. First, participants questioned the speaker; often considerable debate developed in the process. Second, the cadres met separately to examine the implications of the ideas for their particular school community. Here, the references become very specific. The nature of the religious influence on the community became what happens in the church across the street. Does the idea hold up in terms of the particulars of our setting? How must we modify the ideas? What insights do we gain from them? Third, the cadres met together to evaluate the ideas presented and reported on the specific uses to which they put the ideas. This entire interaction process helped to make the ideas more than abstract presentations. They became the basis for evaluating projects and courses of action proposed throughout the program.

Goals and Process

The group process consultants assumed primary responsibility for the second segment of the summer program. Staff and participants alike interacted in a workshop consisting of a series of task which illuminated group interaction process and established goals for individuals, cadres, and the total program, although the major emphasis was on cadre goals. The segment focused on four major aspects of a group working to reach goals--the problems, the resources, the interaction, and the goals.

While this segment can be divided conceptually into these four aspects, it should be emphasized that the instruction was not divided in this fashion. Instead, each activity was a complete process with a clear and valuable end. That is, the instruction was divided into organic units each of which had its own integrity. Perhaps the best way to illustrate this segment is by examples of the activities that were involved.

Individuals met in pairs to tell each other what their most pressing personal problems were in relation to the Ford Training and Placement Program. This process gave us a chance to verbalize our own thoughts and feelings. The questions we asked each other clarified--for ourselves and for the other. The tone was relaxed and nonthreatening. We were speaking quietly and listening intently. If we had not been good listeners, we soon found it out. Each pair met with another pair, and we were asked to explain to the other pair our partner's

concerns. The closing discussion of this activity called on us to analyze the process we had just been through. How were our reports of each other's concerns inadequate? Why? What skills are needed to share problems? Why are personal concerns important? And in the process, we had made a first step in defining problems and setting goals.

Cadres met as groups for the "NASA exercise" an exercise to determine priorities for equipment when stranded on the moon. Half the group observed while the other half worked through the problem. Although a bit fanciful, the exercise created very strong interest, and the group's struggle to make decisions illuminated many problems in group process. The observers pointed out characteristics of the problem-solving group: some people's reticence, other's dominance; the conciliator role, the questioner role, the role of affective support; the use of logic, the search for consensus; the sources of antagonism, the search for harmony. The consultants helped the process by posing questions. Why had the group ignored the science teacher's statement that a compass would not work on the moon? Why was the group so reticent to take issue with the principal? Again the closing discussion asked for analysis of what had happened. And again in the process much was learned about developing priorities and goals in a group setting.

Brainstorming helped cadres make a frustratingly long list of the problems and concerns that were important to them. The cadres also drew up resource lists. The math teacher listed the particular skills that he felt he brought to the group; at the same time, each other cadre member also listed the math teacher's resources. The lists were compared, and people learned about each other as they also explored the problems they faced.

Finally, the cadres stated their goals. They had to deal with limitations and admit that they could have little effect on some important problems. The realism of their goals was brought home most forcefully in the final activity of the segment. Each cadre was asked to dramatize the nature of the problems that they face. In one skit, a cadre depicted a pregnant girl, too embarassed to tell her parents, upset by her brother's vow to kill the boy who had made her pregnant. There were laughs at the posturing of the teachers playing student roles. But there were also profound silences. The segment had

helped participants search into and define the problems they have. It had helped them face the reality of their limitations, and set goals toward which they could work, realistically.

Cross-Role Training

After describing the nature of cross-role training in general, this section takes up in turn the five instructional segments of cross-role training, each devoted to the study of one of the major roles in the cadres -- 1) experienced teacher, 2) teacher intern, 3) role specialist, 4) community representative, and 5) administrator.

The central notion of the program--that educators should work together as a team--was implemented through cross-role training and group development activities. While group development focused on the specifics of the school and the individuals in the group, cross-role training focused on the role and its interaction with other roles.

Cadre members divided into role sets, and each role set took responsibility for part of the cross-role training segment of the program. In the segment for which they were responsible, the group identified the skills specific to the role, the problems they encounter in the role, the nature of the resources they bring to the cadre, and the kind of help they would like to receive from the cadre. The role sets that the program identified were: 1) experienced teacher, 2) teacher intern, 3) specialist, 4) community representative, and 5) administrator.

The goal of this segment was to create team effort by familiarizing all the cadre members with the resources and problems incumbent in each role. But it also served three other functions as well.

First, it provided another mechanism of support for individuals. In the early stages of formation, cadre members tend to segregate themselves by role. They often feel that the people in the other roles are intimidating in one way or another. The administrator resists the insistent desire of others to have greater influence on his behavior and to control his action more than he is used to. The intern is angered by the acceptance of "the system" and the deprication of his ideas for change on the part of the experienced teachers. The experienced teacher is intimidated by the vigor and ideas of the intern. The role specialist is frustrated by the condition that his role is viewed as marginal. The community representative is threatened by the level of formal

schooling that he does not share with the other members of the group. In all these cases, functioning as a separate group allows these people to voice their concerns, make plans to do something about them, and in the process gain support from other members of the role group.

Second, this segment provided a connection between the typical specialist training and the cadre training program. Each role set was coordinated by staff members who represented the role specialty. In the case of interns, the staff members were the University personnel who had been in charge of the training. People in the other role sets were introduced to the University personnel in their special field as the coordinators of the role set subgroups so that the experienced teachers would know the University people well enough to feel free to call upon them for help throughout the coming year. All the cross-role groups, then, served as an interface between role specialist training and cadre training.

Third, the cross-role groups provided a unique setting in which the individuals could consider the problems of their role. The uniqueness of this setting was in its focus on the interaction of the role with the other roles of the school social system. Groups did consider and pursue the kinds of problems that would be typical of regular training in their specialty. But they also considered the task of explaining the role to others. In this respect, they focused on the problems of the role within the school setting--how its implementation could be improved by the actions of others in the system; how its problems could be decreased by changes in the structure of the system. This more pragmatic study of the role led to the consideration of broader problems and the possibility of a broader range of solutions than is typical of specialist training.

The major difficulty of this program segment was that the groups did not have the time necessary to plan their programs. Consequently, these sessions were a compromise between what the groups would have done had they had adequate planning time, and what they were able to do in the brief time available. (For example, the first group--experienced teachers--had only the lunch hours of the first week of the program to do their planning.) The staff had foreseen this difficulty, and had prepared in advance a tentative agenda for each day. But this arrangement is obviously not as adequate as more total participant

planning.

The specific format and content of each role set presentation was the product of that particular group. Each presentation evolved from the interaction of the staff coordinator and the group members, within the context of the particular school settings and particular resources of the individuals involved. Other groups in other years at other institutions would surely evolve different presentations. The specifics presented below are, then, not a prescription. Rather they are a description which gives a hint of the flavor of a group of individuals interacting in cross-role training in a particular time, setting, and context.

The experienced teacher's component chose as the major goal of their segment the analysis of the roles that a teacher plays. They hoped to specify the kinds of skills that are needed in each of these roles. They looked at three major kinds of roles which the teacher plays -- non-classroom roles, administrative and executive roles, and instructional roles -- following the analysis of William Trow[1] ("Role Function of the Teacher in Instructional Groups, " The Dynamics of Instructional Groups , NSSE Yearbook).

When the group had devised this outline for their ideas, they then prepared the format for dealing with these ideas with the other members of the cadres. The first instructional step was to present this general framework to the group and explain the purpose of the segment. A panel of experienced teachers did this. Then each of the three major areas were treated in turn. Final activities involved the entire group in pursuing particular role areas further and in synthesizing the experiences.

For non-classroom teacher roles, Professor Dan Lortie[2] presented a sociologist's analysis of the problems of teaching as a profession. He described the problem of leadership being in the hands of administrators and university professors, the difficulty of establishing performance standards, the individualistic and conservative nature of the rewards in the profession, the physical isolation imposed by school buildings and the consequences of these factors in a low shared concern for the level of performance within the profession. He also considered patterns of recruitment, socialization, and reward as they

---

1. William Trow "Role Function of the Teacher in Instructional Groups," The Dynamics of Instructional Groups, (NSSE Yearbook , 59th Volume PartII 1960)pp. 30-52

2. see e.g. Don C. Lortie " The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching, " in The Heteronomous Professions,

effect the profession. Following discussion with Mr. Lortie, small groups formulated questions about the non-classroom roles of teachers.

The Teacher as a Faculty Member

1. What other duties as a faculty member do we in the elementary and high school have?
2. Should each department in high school assume responsibility for the continuity of the educational program in the prolonged observance of a department member?
3. What are our responsibilities to new teachers and to substitutes?
4. What is a faculty member's responsibility for assembly programs in the high school and in elementary school?
5. How do faculty members act as a resource person to our colleagues?
6. Why can't the elementary teachers teach reading during lunch hour when the weather is inclement?
7. Explain the procedure for chaperoning extracurricular activities.
8. What are the various committees at the high school level that the teacher may be expected to serve? What are the various committees at the elementary level that the teacher may be expected to serve?
9. Are you given make-up time when you are asked to serve in some other capacity on your duty-free period?

The Teacher as a Community Liaison

1. In what respect is the teacher a member of the school community?
2. a. What is a community liaison person as a teacher?
   b. How do you see the teacher as the community liaison person?
3. a. How does a teacher become aware of the community needs?
   b. How does the teacher make the community aware of the school needs?
4. How do we as teachers identify the resources within the community (human and material)?
5. What other services are available outside the community that will meet its needs?
6. a. Should a teacher be selective of his/her community involvement?
   b. How and to what extent should a teacher get involved in community activities?
7. To what extent does the school and/or the Board of

Education policies structure the relationship of teacher to community and vice-versa?

8. How can we be more creative and innovative in involving parents in the school program?

The Teacher as a Learner

How do you see yourself as a learner?

1. What are the methods for a teacher to keep up-to-date in their subject matter?
2. What criteria is needed to be selective in securing resources?
3. Can one be sure that self-analysis will be constructive and not destructive?
4. Can rapport with school environment establish the fact that one is providing for individual differences?
5. How important is being an effective listener and observer to the learning situation?
6. Does the teacher as a learner have to be aware of the students culture to be effective; that is, his psychological, physiological, emotional, socialogical, and economical background?
7. What constitutes being receptive and sensitive to subject matter and students?

The movie High School[1] was the introduction to the administrative and executive roles of the teacher. Discussion was focused by the movie not on the travail that these roles cause teachers, but rather on the effects that performance in these roles has on the students of the school. Also in connection with these roles, each experienced teacher showed a small group of the others (administrators, role specialists, interns, and community representatives) the details of the administrative tasks in their particular school--the forms for record keeping, the obligations to extracurricular activities, and so forth.

For the instructional role Professor Herbert Thelen[2] described his model for an ideal of student-teacher interaction. Following his presentation, subgroups were formed by subject matter at the high school level and by grade level at the

---

1. Frederick Wiseman, High School , Zipporah Films, (Boston, Mass. 1970) .

2. Herbert A Thelen "Insights for Teaching from a Theory of Interactions"in The Nature of Teaching:Implications for the Education of Teachers (Milwaukee, Wisc The Edward A. Wright Foundation, 1962)

elementary level. These groups--again under the direction of an experienced teacher--discussed how they could implement the ideas that Mr. Thelen had presented.

Now that everyone had considered these major roles of the teacher, they were introduced to some of the major problems and conflicts that the experienced teachers felt in the performance of their roles. The experienced teachers in teams of two planned--with the help of other cadre members--brief role playing scenes to illustrate problems. These were followed by brief discussion. Finally, as a synthesizing activity, all the members of the cadres chose one of the twelve specific role tasks from the outline above. These small groups specified that subtask in detail by listing the specific behavious involved and their import for the teacher. They charted the information below for each behavior which they listed.[1]

TASK	FREQUENCY OF PERFORMANCE	TYPE OF PERFORMANCE	IMPORTANCE	LEARNING DIFFICULTIES

The results of these analyses were typed, compiled, and distributed to all cadre members.

On the final day of the experienced teacher segment, program participants were given a review of what was emphasized, an indication of just where that happened (or should have happened), and suggestions on where they could go to find out more about those skills, techniques, or knowledge introduced to them in the segment. The distributed ditto follows:

(see Chart 1)

1. This scheme is taken large from Robert F. Mager's, Developing Vocational Instruction.

Chart 1

During the past week or so you have had the opprtunity to witness a fantastic display of knowledge, skills, and techniques you can use in your teaching, administration, or occupational role speciality. Our task now as experienced teachers is to help you make cognitive closure through the technique of instructional closure.

Here is what you have learned (how about exposed to?) so far:

Knowledge, Skill, or Technique	Where, When, or How	Where Similar or Additional Skills, Techniques, or Knowledge can be acquired
1. Knowledge of Role of Teacher	In small groups where you detailed tasks of teachers (see attached sheets)	Ford Staff, Process Consultants
2. Beginning Point in how to organize a course of study	Ibid. (See Administrative and Executive Role-"Planner"-on sheets.	U. R. T, Ford Staff
3. Small Group Techniques (Introduction to Group Dynamics and Group Management) (Applicable to all roles in the program)	Ibid. Whenever you worked in small groups,	Process consultants and Ford Staff
4. Knowledge of Specific Classroom Teaching Skills		
a. Stimulation Variation	Use of movie, Speakers, videotape, Role Playing Small Groups, Total Gp. Thelen's Entire Presentation	Micro-teaching, Ford Staff, U.R.T., Process Consultants, Follow Cadre Members
b. Set Induction (pre-instructional orientation)	Ibid.	Ibid.
c. Silence and non-verbal cues (applicable to all roles)	Used by T. Griffin, H. Thelen, S. Tolbert, J. McCampbell, F. Kimmons, Process Consultants	Ibid.
d. Reinforcement Skills (All Roles)	All over the place	Ibid.

e.	Fluency in asking questions (All Roles)	Ibid.	Ibid.
f.	Probing Questions	Ibid.	Ibid.
g.	Recognizing Attending Behavior (All Roles)	Ibid.	Ibid.
h.	Illustrating and use of examples	Ibid.	Ibid.
i.	Lecturing	We all know that one	All of Us
j.	Planned Repetition	No comment	
k.	Closure (pulling together)	You got it this morning in role playing and here it is on these pages.	Micro-teaching, Lead Staff, Process Consultants, U. R. T, Fellow Cadre Members

FINALLY--we made instructional closure. You have to make cognitive closure. What's the difference? Here--I will quote from a book you can get at most libraries: "Instructional closure is reached when the lesson is completed and the teacher has shown the link between past knowledge and new knowledge. Cognitive closure is reached when the students have reached closure and the link between old and new knowledge has been made." (Can you dig it?) See D. Allen and Kevin Ryan, Microteaching (Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley Publishing Co., Inc.) p. 20.

WANT A PLACE TO TRY OUT SOME OF THIS STUFF IN A CONTROLLED SETTING? TRY YOUR CADRE OR FEW MEMBERS YOU GOT TO KNOW WHO MIGHT HELP.

This final review of the experienced teacher segment of crossrole training was important because 1) it is in keeping with the developmental nature of the program; 2) it pin-pointed some specific ways individuals and groups could use available resources; 3) it allowed for automony in selection of areas individuals or groups might want to pursue in depth, according to their own needs and professional interests; 4) it suggests at least four areas that could, ideally, be covered in the development of competency as a teacher; 5) finally, it suggested one of the functions of the cadre -- a place to try out a lot of "new stuff" in a controlled and friendly setting with the possibility of help and feedback from others.

Notice the wide range of activities that were involved in this segment. There were presentations by outstanding authorities, cadre discussions, and small group discussions of these conceptual inputs. There was emotional involvement through the role playing activities. There was intellectual involvement through the analysis of subtasks. The results of these activities were a relatively exhaustive description of the role and its subroles and tasks; a consideration of the difficulties and problems involved in the role; and a much higher level of consciousness and sensitivity to the role on the part of everyone involved.

The intern component of the summer program evolved from the two different sets of background experiences of the interns. On the one hand, there were those who had just completed a year of academic training in the Master of Arts in Teaching or Master of Science in Teaching at the University. Typically, these interns were liberal arts graduates of prestige universities who had had no teaching experience. Most of them were young; most of them were white. On the other hand were those with three to five years experience at the cadre school who had been accepted into the MAT or MST program and were just beginning their academic work. Most of them were black. Both groups of interns were making a financial sacrifice to enter the program. The would work only half time in the school and receive only three quarters salary for their work. In any other situation they would be making full salary-a difference of between $2,000 and $3,000.

Because of the two differing backgrounds, the group defined two major goals. For the experienced teacher interns, the goal was induction into the social system of the University. Since the new interns were familiar with the University and its programs, they were able to help the experienced teacher interns "learn the ropes," advising them about professors, procedures, courses, and course sequences. Much of the time the interns spent in their subgroup was spent in this way.

For the new interns, the goal was induction into the social system of the school . This was the focus of the intern's segment of the summer program. The group chose two questions to guide their presentation:

Who as I ?

What is my role as teacher?

Where the experienced teachers had chosen to emphasize the formal analysis of the skills and tasks involved in teaching, the interns chose to emphasize the more personalistic aspects of teaching-interaction with students and interaction with peers.

The first presentation dealt with the problems of new teachers in their interaction with students. A former director of the MAT program, described experiences of former MAT's in their first weeks of school and led the entire group in a discussion of a video-tape of a young white teacher with a class of Black students. The discussion focused on the personal qualities that help a teacher succeed. The second portion of this presentation dealt with the skills that help a teacher succeed. He described the techniques of micro-teaching, the kinds of results that could be expected from such training, distributed booklets on micro-teaching for specific skills,[1] and encouraged members of the group to participate in training sessions that were taking place during the summer.

The second presentation was by a graduate student in education psychology. The focus in the session was on the causes of teacher behavior. The presentation was again personalistic, following the line of study of Benjamin Wright who has said,

> When we find we are having trouble with a certain child, that is a good time to sit back and ask ourselves whether we are getting anything special out of his misbehavior. Is his misbehavior so much like our own projected faults that we find it exceptionally intolerable and can be reassured only by punishing him excessively? Do we enjoy too much the trouble he causes others?. . . The first crucial step is to know these reasons for what they are: good, bad, or indifferent. Once we know these reasons, then, instead of being used by them, we will find that we can begin deliberately to use them in the service of highest ideals, in the service of becoming the better teachers we want to be.[2]

The third presentation was by another graduate student in educational administration. He described the advantages of formal instruments for the analysis of classroom behaviors, and worked in detail on the use of the CERLI VERBAL BEHAVIOR CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM.[3]

1. Kevin Ryan, Microteaching
2. See E.C.Benjamin Wright "Some Personal Motives for Teaching," Chicago Schools Journal, November, 1958 pp.69 and 74.
3. Wayne Doyle "Transactional Evaluation In Program Development"

The final presentation was role playing by the interns of different types of teachers in their interaction with students.

The entire set of presentations focused on the interaction of teachers with students. The deeply personal approach of self-examination, the skits of types of teachers, a video tape of classroom behavior, formal analysis of classroom interaction, and the use of micro-teaching had all played some part in sensitizing the participants to the complexities of student-teacher interaction and to approaches for improving the interaction. Certainly none of the approaches was developed in any depth. But the smorgasbord had served its purpose in giving a taste of each of these approaches. As resources, each approach was available for continued pursuit in depth by individuals or groups during the coming school year.

The role specialists faced the most difficult task in presenting their roles to the program participants. They were a very diverse group, including a teacher nurse, adult educators, a psychological specialist, reading consultants, social workers, teacher aides, and counsellors. But all of them shared a sense of frustration because their roles were viewed as peripheral by the teachers, and because they felt that others in the school did not understand and did not take advantage of the services they could offer. As a consequence, the group proved to be extremely valuable to its members because it gave them a time, a place, and a sympathetic ear for trying to deal with their problems. While such a supportive group is unusual for most professionals in schools, it was an absolutely unique experience for these role specialists. They were eager for the opportunity, and began their preparation early.

In April when the plans of the staff for the entire summer program were fairly clear, the staff subgroup devoted to role specialists contacted the role specialists who would be program participants during the summer. This planning was, in fact, so early that some role specialists - both in the schools and in University programs - had not made a final decision about their participation. All these were invited by the staff subgroup to attend a program conference planned to disseminate the program to other colleges and universities. The new specialists met after the conference to consider five questions:

1. What questions do you have about the cadre program?
2. What is my role in the school?
3. How do I operate within the role?
4. What special competencies do I bring to the school?
5. What structures would allow us to share this information during the

summer program?

In answering these questions, the specialists began to identify the way they would handle their segment, and the kinds of activities they needed in the summer program to improve their own competencies. They also formulated two more sets of questions for their next meeting. One was questions for the staff. The second was a more specific set about their roles.

1. How is a new role introduced into a system?
2. Who do you have to deal with?
3. What are the processes for dealing with them?
4. Who is your client?
   a. What are his characteristics?
   b. What are your goals for him?
5. What resources do you bring to the situation?
6. What resources are necessary? Where can you get the ones you do not have?
7. What are your intake? Contract? Long term goals? Short terms goals? Milieu?
8. If there are problems in answering these questions, what can be done about it?

In answering these questions the specialist group developed an agenda which carried them through six long meetings. Each role analyzed its primary and secondary clientele. They compared their clientele to that of other roles and discovered in the process part of the reason why they were viewed as peripheral. They developed a set of goals for their segment of the summer program and a series of activities to reach those goals. Again, the main point of this rather long-winded paragraph is that the process of developing the plans for the summer program was - for both staff and participants - a learning experience in itself which greatly broadened the context within which the specialists viewed their jobs and their problems.

The first instructional segment introduced the role specialists and their relationship to the cadre. The took advantage of a tape-slide presentation, "Bride Over Troubled Waters" which describes the program and discusses the place of specialists within it. Following that presentation three of the specialist roles were described in detail, and the participants then divided into small groups directed by a specialist to react to the presentations and ask questions.

The answers to the questions were incorporated in to the following instruction.

The second segment focused on the relationships of the specialists to other members of the social system. Again, particular roles were described in detail. Following the descriptions, all the specialist roles were portrayed in a chart which showed their relationships to both the University, the school, and the client systems. Emphasis was placed on the variety of resources and the variety of connections represented by role specialists which are not available in any other roles. To conclude this segment, small groups used a case study method to evaluate their understanding of the specialist roles and their interaction with other roles. Each small group was to determine what resources should be contacted to treat eight case studies. The three case studies below show how this activity helped illuminate both the value of the specialists and their inter-connected relationships in solving a variety of problems. Below are three of those case studies.

> Mrs. Martin teaches modern world history in a High school. Her classes are reasonably orderly and she has few serious disciplinary problems, but the students show a lack of interest in the subject and give little evidence of learning. On several occasions she has glanced through articles in professional journals suggesting innovative approaches and new motivational techniques. She would like to try some of them but feels that she needs to know more or perhaps see them in action and doesn't know how to proceed.
>
> Tanya is in the fifth grade. Her age is twelve. She vacillates in her behavior between being disruptive and somewhat withdrawn. The children like her as she is imaginative, enjoys sports and art. She usually doodles when it's time to work although she occasionally will answer questions on math. The teacher is uncertain about her reading ability as Tanya was absent for last year's Metropolitan Achievement Test. The teacher hasn't had a chance to give the kids informal reading tests since there are too many discipline problems in the class.
>
> The school is about to initiate and make plans for implementing a new reading program. The community and parents need to be advised of the new program.

The final instructional segment achieved two goals. First, it gave an air of authority and support to the specialists by having University faculty members discuss the problems of using role specialist skills as a major advance over typical school programs. Following the faculty presentations, participants met in cadre groups. In these meetings, the role specialists described their goals in terms specific to the school. The cadre responded by identifying ways they could help the specialists reach their goals, and ways the specialists would be expected to contribute their special resources to the achievement of the goals of other individuals and the goals of the cadre as a group.

The administrators chose to follow much the same pattern as the experienced teachers, the interns, and the role specialist. The first session began with a film presentation of principal trying to solve a conflict between two teachers; one was a long-established faculty member and the other was the wife of a board member. Participants were divided into small groups and guided through the analysis of the film by the administrators, much as if the participants were administrators in training. The total group reconvened, reported on small group sessions, and then brainstormed to list the various kinds of situations that administrators face in their job. The session closed with each administrator providing his analysis of the movie and answering participant's questions.

The second session began the study of administrative situations, focusing on their role in improving the instructional program. One group of participants role-played a mother-teacher conflict over grading and content. A second dealt with a department planning curriculum improvement. The discussion of these incidents led to an analysis of the kinds of decisions an administrator faces. In small groups, participants defined the people touched by a decision, and the negative and positive effects of alternative decisions on all those people. The closing whole group discussion attempted to answer the questions, "Which decisions should the administrator make?" and, "Which decisions should he delegate to other?"

The third session began with a panel of the administrators. They reviewed the process thus far and pointed out that it had focused primarily on the part of their job that relates most directly to the others in the cadre. They then described situations which each of them had faced in their schools which had been major parts of their job but were essentially unknown to the the professional staff. Questions and answers followed.

The final session took place in the cadre groups where the cadres looked at the following questions:

1. What should be the role of the principal in the school?

2. What should be the role of the principal in the cadre?
3. " special resources does the principal have?
4. How should the principal share authority?
5. " " " " " " " responsibility?
6. What are the implications of these answers for the way the cadre will operate in the school?

The community component of the summer program was designed to help community representatives, their respective communities, and their respective cadres develop mutual expectations that were reality based. It was felt that this would lead to the identification of shared goals and provide a basis for interchanging resources. However, before the community representatives could help others gain an understanding of their role, they themselves had to acquire a firm sense of role identity.

Several presummer meetings were held with community members from cadres active at that time. The purpose of these meetings was to draw upon the experiences of these persons in identifying key issues that the new community representatives would likely be confronted with upon entering the program - issues that had implication for role induction and for planning the community component of the summer program. Several questions arose from these meetings:

1. What expectations should the staff and cadres have of community representatives?
2. What expectations should the community representatives have of staff and cadres?
3. What resources do community representatives bring to the program?
4. What resources can the staff and cadres provide to help community representatives implement their role?
5. What expectations should their communities have of them and of the FTPP?

At the initial meeting of the new community representatives it was agreed that pursuit of these questions would handle most of the concerns they had around forming perceptions of their roles and planning the community component of the summer program. A number of subsequent meetings between cadres and community representatives as well as between staff and community representatives, and the structure of the earlier components of the summer program, e.g., FTPP expectations, the role of the experienced teacher, etc., helped them develop a somewhat broad sense of role identity. For example, it was generally agreed that a major function of the community representative would be that of a liaison between the cadre and the community, but how that was defined might have

varied from cadre to cadre. Nevertheless, their grasp of role was more than sufficient to enable them to plan content for their segment of the summer program.

The community component of the summer program had two major objectives:

1) To familiarize the community representatives with FTPP, cadre, and school expectations and resources.
2) To identify possible role functions and resources of the community representative in the cadre and the school-community social system.

The content of the program consisted of a panel presentation on community perspectives of educational priorities. The panel members were community people selected by the community representatives. There was a good deal of exchange, sometimes heated, during the discussion that followed the panel presentations. Some experienced teacher members of one cadre, for example, resented some of the critical comments of one panel member and questioned whether that person actually represented a broader community point of view or just that of one person. In any event, the salient issues generated considerable discussion. The next activity consisted of tours of the local school communities with lunch and cadre meetings in the communities. One of the cadres felt that it had adequate exposure to the community and decided, instead of a tour, to invite students and parents to the school for informal discussion. Luncheon meetings between the cadres and cross-sections of the local school communities highlighted the tours. The meetings were convened by the community representatives and provided an opportunity for face-to-face contact between cadre members and parents and other members of the community. Both the panel presentation and the tour were designed to help acquaint cadre members with community expectations and resources, and to help the community become familiar with the expectations and resources, and to help the community become familiar with the expectations and resources of the cadre. There was also an opportunity for cross-cadre sharing of tour experience.

The final cadre meetings were designed to enable cadre members to give feedback to community representatives on their perceptions of the community representative's role and how they can help the community representative implement that role. Although there were many shared perceptions, there were also some differences that had to be worked out. For example, some members of one cadre felt that the community representative should be responsible for attending virtually all community meetings and share any pertinent information with the cadre. The community representative and several other members

of the cadre felt that this was unrealistic as a responsibility for any one person. After some discussion, it was agreed that the responsibility for attending community meetings would be divided among several cadre members.

At best, the community component of the summer program provided an orientation to the role of the community representative. The operationalizing of this role takes place over a much longer period of time; consequently new shared perceptions will be discovered, and differences will emerge to be negotiated.

The study of these five roles -- experienced teacher, teacher intern, role specialist, community representative, and administrator--directed primarily by the participants made up the cross-rde training section of the summer training program. This cross-rde training was, of course, integrally related to the two segments which proceeded it -- Black perspectives, and goals and process -- and to the two segments to which we now turn -- competency and group development.

The first task of the competency segment of the summer program was to establish linkages with the experienced teachers and to develop the linkages already established.

The import of this task was meetings of subgroups on the basis of special competence areas. These groups typically included members of both the secondary and the elementary cadres. For example, the subgroup on reading included elementary teachers and secondary reading consultants. The psychological group included elementary teachers working with the educationally mentally handicapped, social workers at both elementary and secondary levels and counselors at the secondary level. Some elementary teachers chose to join a subject matter group such as math or science. These groups met under the supervision of the University professor responsible for the area. These meetings functioned to : 1) acquaint the University professors with the problems of the schools, 2) provide experienced teachers with resources for improving their competency, 3)give a pragmatic grounding to the work of inexperienced interns, and 4) establish work groups and projects which could continue to function throughout the coming school year.

The second task of the competency segment of the program was to integrate role training into the larger context of the cadre social system goals. Obviously, if role competence training operated in isolation, both the focus of the program on collegiality and the view of the school as a social system would be under-

mined. Consequently, the small groups working on role competency tasks were only one part of this training segment.

A second part of the competency segment was the development of plans for cross-subject matter projects. The development of these subgroups was primarily on the basis of individual interest and choice among the suggested alternatives. Biology and physics might be combined in a curriculum plan to have students make their own cameras and use them in photographing local flora and fauna. Many subject specialists might work to develop plans for improving reading in the content areas. English and art might be joined in the development of a curriculum unit on symbolism. The possibilities here were limited only by the imagination of the participants. Again, the groups were under the supervision of the appropriate professors, and the projects continued into the school year.

A third direction of the competency work was the evolution of curriculum plans by each cadre. The elementary cadre found it necessary to discuss how the teacher interns would function. There was ambivalence about whether they should have their own classes or prepare special instruction for small groups from regular classes. Since one of the high schools was to have an emphasis on performing arts, their discussions centered on the implications of that emphasis for the subject disciplines of the school. Since the cadre was to plan curriculum development activities that would include every member, the professors divided themselves into three groups with one group meeting regularly with each of the three cadres. It was our judgement that this consistency would be more fruitful than trying to juggle back and forth as the topic in each cadre shifted from one subject matter area to another in a relatively unpredictable fashion.

The fourth focus of competency was direct confrontation of the problem of integrating the effort toward professional competency with the other efforts of the program. These discussions were held by the total group, by cadre group, by cross-discipline project groups, and by competency groups. The guiding questions were:

1. Do I feel that the projects I am involved in will be fruitful in improving my professional competence?
2. Will this project further the larger goals of the cadre as well as my professional competency?

3. Should my project be revised to make it more congruent with the cadre goals?

4. Should the cadre goals be revised to make them more congruent with my personal goals?

While there were no specific outcomes from these discussions in terms of improved professional competency, they served to raise everyone's level of consciousness about the relationship of his own development to the development of the entire program of the school. The discussions increased the integrity of the various efforts that were being made within the program by increasing the sense of shared respnsibility and shared goal.

The major difficulty which we encountered was scheduling. The competency sessions were planned for one day a week every week because this was the most likely way to get all the appropriate professors present at the same time. While they were extremely cooperative, their regular duties sometimes interferred with the competency sessions. Also, because the cross-role groups or the cadres would develop crisis or powerful topics of discussion, they were often unwilling to shift to competency sessions on the appointed day. For both these reasons, the competency sessions were less than satisfactory. Although many projects were developed, many individuals developed skills, and much curriculum work was integrated into the cadre goals, we were dissatisfied with the extent of the success in the competency sessions.

Group Development

It is in the cadre work group that all the aspects of the program must come to fruition. (The nature of group development is considered more fully in Chp. 8 .) The goals, the context, cross-role training, and professional competency are integrated by the cadre group. The syntheses of these can be accomplished only by a group that can work together as a team. The group development segment of the summer program has, then, as its primary objective, the development of a group competent to integrate the training into a program that will have a positive effect on the members of the cadre, the cadre as a group, the school in which the cadre operates and , ultimately the education of the students of the school.

The summer program is only the beginning of the group development process which extends through the next school year. There are several areas that group development involves. These areas are not considered academically as direct instructional matters, nor are they isolated from each other. Rather, the training takes place in the pragmatic setting of the cadre attempting to define and come to grips with its problems. It is impossible to predict

exactly how far the cadre will develop during the summer in terms of a particular area. The nature of the problems encountered and the people involved will determine the relative development in different areas to a great extent. While these areas of development are isolated below, in reality they are integrated, and growth occurs through the sensitive direction of the two staff people responsible for cadre development--the cadre liaison and the group process consultant.

The group process consultant's skills have been mentioned above in the context of establishing goals. He is introduced to the cadre through those activities and continues to meet with the cadre at every meeting throughout the summer and through the internship year. The cadre liaison is a person familiar with the Chicago public schools (usually he has taught in Chicago for 3-5 years) and with the University of Chicago (usually he is a graduate student). His task is to help the cadre develop as a group and make sure that they take advantage of University resources. His is the key role in the operation of the program. He has direct responsibility for the cadre's development and success.

The major areas of cadre development are:

The role of the cadre vis-a-vis others in the school

Understanding what a cadre is

Status distinctions

Realistic goal setting

Relation of roles within the group

Leadership

Relating to community

Group decision processes

Continuity of agenda

Developing and completing projects

Trust and interpersonal relations

Sharing

In each of these areas it is possible to define an ideal for the cadre and some stages that occur in moving toward the ideal. The stages tend to be cyclic rather than linear; cadres regress as well as progress. And the areas of development are bound to each other so that progress in one area is closely related to progress in another area.

Let's trace a part of one cadre's development in terms of group decision-making to see how some of these areas of development interact with each other. In one of the first meetings of the cadre, each member identified goals that he had in mind. The task that confronted the cadre was synthesizing these individual goals and, in the process, establishing the goals of the cadre. One social studies teacher emphasized the need for the social studies curriculum to integrate the black experience. The cadre accepted this goal in a passive way; they did not ask questions about it because at this early stage of their development they were embarrassed to question each other. The result of the lack of questioning was a very long list of goals made up of individual goals and goals too general to be meaningful. The appropriate synthesis had not taken place. The cadre had not really arrived at a concensus; they had merely accepted a list.

The superficiality of their agreement became apparent as they tried to specify a project that they would work on at the school during the coming year. The general goals which they had set for themselves were ignored as they talked more realistically about what was happening at their school. Since the principal was in charge of summer school at the high school, he attended cadre meetings infrequently. Yet as the group tried to settle on a plan for projects for the coming year, they were consistently faced with the impass of the need for the principal's cooperation and approval. The relation of his role to the cadre was a major obstacle to the group decision process.

Obviously, work on developing a project was very frustrating. Also, there were many issues which seemed to be more immediately interesting than these long-range plans. The consequence of these two factors was that the cadre easily got off the subject. Issues from the cross-role or competency sessions took priority. The group was bogged down in its variety of interests. As members of the group became aware of this problem (with the help of the liaison and group process consultant) they developed self-discipline. They would not let staff interrupt. They appointed a chairman to make an agenda. They took turns taking minutes. As these mechanisms for continuity developed, the group was more and more able to stick to the topic and make progress.

Their training in group process problems and skills stood them in good stead at this point. They were no longer embarrassed to evaluate another member's ideas. (In fact, they tended to err in the opposite direction.) With this

ability to evaluate and the continuity of attention to a problem, they began to make progress. As they looked at each individual's goals they were able to make appraisals about its appropriateness to the group. In some instances, they suggested that the goal be pursued individually. In other instances, they saw the goal as important to the entire group. Everyone agreed, for example, that the social studies teachers' concern for integrating the Black experience transcended the social studies curriculum and was, in fact, just one symptom of a far larger issue. The cadre at this point was beginning to see the need for collective decision-making, and the establishment of goals important to everyone.

In the process of group decision-making they had made great progress. But they were not as yet realistic in the goals which they set. The issue taken from the social studies teacher was broadened to look at its source--racism. In a summer program with no responsibilities to meet classes, with plenty of time to think, they were without a solid reality base to guide them. It is not surprising, then, that much time was spent discussing goals that the cadre did not have the capacities to reach. But they had now put their collective finger on what they all agreed was a key issue.

The process of group decision-making was now apparent in their shaping and reshaping of this single goal and and others like it. The interns continued to ask, "When am I going to get help with all the little things like how to take attendance and where the ditto machine is?" "How do other new teachers learn about these things?""Why are you talking about racism when you won't even help me learn where the books are kept that we have now?" In this way, the interns forced an issue. The discussion recognized for the first time that there was not a norm of sharing operating at the school.

The resulting synthesis of ideas is a remarkable example of the ideal of the cadre program. Since the majority of the interns were White, failure to share obviously had racial implications. It also put sharing in a larger context--not just the peripheral duties of teaching but also the central task of understanding and adapting to the culture of the students. Since the cadre was aware that this was not a norm in the school, they saw that sharing could have an important effect on the social system if it could become a norm. They worked out a plan to develop a teacher handbook which would share the details of the school and how it runs. They agreed to invite other faculty members to join them in social and educational meetings with <u>all</u> the new teachers.

They envisioned a group where experienced teacher cadre members would act as helpers to get other experinced teachers to share; where cadre interns could give support to other new teachers. The entire group would be helping to set a norm of sharing while at the same time helping new teachers improve their competence.

The cadre was not out of the woods yet. Although they had synthesized many goals into a practical project through a sound process of group decision-making, this was their first time through the process. Consequently, they were not aware of the insufficiencies of their planning. They were impatient. They were not willing to consider alternatives or other persons' views. They did not give ample time to people who objected and consequently decreased the cooperation and the number of ideas they had to work with.

Other instances could illustrate the nature of the other areas of cadre development. But this one instance shows <u>how</u> the process develops through the nature of the particular group and <u>why</u> it is futile to talk about these areas in terms of abstract stages. As John Robinson, one of the cadre liaisons, said in a recent staff meeting:

> It's too bad you can't just tell cadre members what is wrong and how they should correct it. But you can't. They have to work their way through it. You can't talk about it; they just have to go through it. It's tedious and frustrating and sometimes they just can't make any decisions at all. But somehow they seem to learn in the process. It's just slow going, that's all.

But cadres do, in fact, develop. And the first major steps of that development are made during the summer program.

In summary, the program had five major segments. First, participants introduced to the context of the program--training cadres for placement in particular schools in the Black community of Chicago. Second, they studied group process, and each cadre and individual set goals for the summer. After these introductory segments, the program continued with three major training inputs. Cross-role training analyzed each role in the cadre in order to improve participants sensitivity to and help with each other's problems, and to improve their use of each other's resources. Competency training focused on professional skills for each individuals, for small groups in cross-subject matter curriculum development, and for total cadres. Group development training took place in the context of cadres defining problems and developing solutions for those problems. They learned to work together as teams and made tentative plans for their activities during the year.

EVALUATION

We have now looked at the summer training program in detail. The next question is obvious: was it effective? Did it set out to do the things that were important to do? Was it successful in its efforts? In this section on evaluation of the summer training program, we will look at these two questions in turn. First, we will consider the viability of the model of training by comparing it to other models that might have been used. Then, we will evaluate the training program in terms of its adequacy in fulfilling its own model.

Models for training

It is rather surprising that the summer training of the Ford Program took the shape that it did in light of the nature of the education complex of the University of Chicago and the kinds of models that environment might seem to imply.

Research oriented universities are certainly appropriate places for the development of theoretical or conceptual models of the variables and structures that are significant to a given field of study. Inner city teachers, and inner city schools are the repositories of a great deal of data and intuitive information about the nature of the inner city child and the inner city school system, and the inner city community. The curriculum development models of the 1950's and 1960's are working designs for the cooperation of scholars and teachers in the development of improved methods and materials of instruction. There is, then, an obvious model for the development of knowledge about inner city education that is available for a program of teacher training for the inner city at a research oriented university. Scholars and teachers could work together to develop theoretical models of the nature of the inner city child explicating specifically how he is similar to and different from other children. The criteria for such statements could be the mutual satisfaction of the scholars' competence in theory construction and the practitioners intuitive knowledge of the nature of the children. This knowledge base, when developed, would be available as the basis for the development of curriculum materials and structural reorganization, again as cooperative venture between practitioners and scholars. Such an approach would use the scholarly process of knowledge production and knowledge application that seems much more in line with the expertise of the University of Chicago than what was, in fact, attempted. But the program did not attempt such work and did not achieve any results which cast light on the questions implicit in such work.

The program might also have had a product orientation. That is, rather than starting from the nature of the inner city child, it could take as its point of departure the goals of instruction and work to produce materials which accomplished those goals, carefully researching their effectiveness and preparing them for general consumption. Again, the competencies for which the university is known -- the ability to develop curriculum, the ability to research and evaluate instructional programs, and the ability to write -- would have been basic to such an effort. But again, the program did not take this direction in its training.

Instead, what the program did do - within the parameters of the conceptual model - was to view the learner as autonomous, self-directing, and responsible for his own learning. The implications of this view of the learner for the educational program are that the program should provide a rich environment from which the learner will choose those aspects which are most congruent with his sense of what he should be about. The selection of environmental things to make available to the learner should be determined from the instructor's knowledge of what the learner wants rather than from the instructor's beliefs about what the learner <u>needs</u>. Consequently, the major evaluation of the educational program is the learner's affective response to the value of what he did rather than his cognitive or behavioral response to the instructor's testing of what he believes the learner should have been doing.

There are many reasons why the program took the particular form that it did. Let me mention some of them. First, the various tugs and pulls to make the Ford Training and Placement Program one thing or another by the various groups of interested faculty kept the program from defining explicitly a narrowed set of behavioral objectives. Second, the committee organization which dominated the program and which moved in various interest directions according to the particular committee again decreased the chances of defining specific behavioral objectives for the program. Third, the transactional style and direction within the program also added to the diffuseness and lack of specific objectives. So for all these reasons, there was a lack of specificity about what the program wanted to do that created a vacuum around the topic of the specific objectives of training in the program.

These same kinds of conflicts existed within the staff of the program , and the turnover of staff further hampered any efforts to stabalize the program around a carefully spelled out set of objectives. Also, when staff was able

to agree upon a particular thrust that should be followed by the program, very often the direction was met by hostility and resistance on the part of cadre members. More bluntly, they often refused to do what they were told to do. This rebellion was particularly apparent in the area of evaluation, where many Black participants refused the role of guinea pigs for a white university. Consequently, the early efforts by the R.and E. staff were reduced to affective measures, so that the impetus for formulating more specific objectives that could have come from R and E. was negated by the limitations that they could not do very much about.

Aside from these negative reasons that kept the program from being more directing, there was a strong feeling on the part of most staff members that theoretical and hardnosed instructional approaches were not going to be effective in solving problems in schools. There was a very strong belief that the only real solution was a grass roots one, developed by the actors in response to the problems as they saw them, and that impositions of direction from the program would not really do the job.

In spite of this, it must be admitted that the model used for the summer training program did not take full advantage of the expertise of the University of Chicago faculty resources in the research development and production of knowledge as it might have.

Evaluation of the program in terms of fulfilling its own model

First, let's be a bit more specific about the program as a learner self-directing model. The fact that there were at least three days of work focused on the nature of the program and its goals at the beginning of the summer program suggests that there was a strong intent to determine the kinds of things that the learners would be doing and the kinds of perimeters that were appropriate for their activity within the confines of the program. The program went much further than that. If you are going to be a member of a Ford Cadre, then there are a number of things that you must deal with -- the nature of the Black experience, the progress of group development, the improvement of curriculum, and the attack of school wide problems. These things were imperatives of the program that the staff tried consistently and insistently to focus the learners attention and activity on. But within these bounds, there was a great deal of freedom for the learners to develop their own schemes. They were not told the nature of the Black experience; they were not told how to solve the particular problems that their group got into; they were not told what the curriculum that they developed should look like; they were not told what the problems of their school were ; after they identified problems, they were not told how to solve them.

Participants were not left to their own devices; in every area of concern, there were people available on the spot to help them struggle through these problems and give them guidance. But they were encouraged to develop their own devices and to solve their own problems; the people available were resources, not sources of direction. The instructors claimed only the expertise of method of attack in these areas. If isolation was to be overcome, if curriculum was to be improved, if groups were to develop in a healthy manner, the instructors were willing to claim that they knew how to go about reaching these goals.

But the instructors did <u>not</u> claim expertise in the content of these processes for the inner city. The staff did not claim expertise in knowing what problems a group would identify that would not be identified by isolated teachers. The methods professors did not claim to know exactly, how the curriculum should be changed for inner city youngsters. The process consultants did not claim to be experts on the dynamics peculiar to groups of teachers working at an inner city school. The expertise claimed was the expertise of method of attack, not the expertise of knowing the answers. And the learners were not expected to become experts in these processes. Instead, they were expected to get help from those who had expertise. The answers were to be developed by the learner to the satisfaction of the learners with the support and assistance of the instructors as resources. While the learners were not free to determine what areas (group process, school problems, and curriculum were identified for them) or what process (the instructors were experts in these processes) to consider, they were free to use these processes to bring out their own expertise about the content--the content of the inner city school in which they had expertise that their instructors did not have.

The model was, then, a model of the learner as a self-directing autonomous person willing to accept the parameters set by the program model. And given this kind of model, certain kinds of effects can be anticipated.

First, each individual and each group will essentially formulate its own curriculum and consequently each individual's and each group's outcomes will be highly personalized and individualistic. This was in fact the case. The chapters on Group Development and Curriculum Development show in some detail that each of these groups involved itself in different problems, different directions, and produced very different kinds of products, even when the "area" of production was very similar. (For example, the illustrations of English curriculum

work cited on pp. 12 - 16 are very different. Each was the response of a particular group to the problem as they saw it, and was different from the product of a different group operating in the same program.

Second, the program can be expected to change toward greater and greater learner participation, and toward a congruity between learner satisfaction and the program's conceptual model. That is, each year, the program can be expected to come closer to dealing with the kind of emphasis that will accomplish the goals of the conceptual model. As it approaches this kind of emphasis, it can also be expected to change so that participants find greater and greater satisfaction in participating in the program. This, too, was the case. The development of the final summer program was a response to the participants' likes and dislikes in the previous summer program and it was also a movement toward dealing directly with the goals of the conceptual model. The success of this movement is witnessed by the research and evaluation reports on the summer program.

The summer program of 1971 was clearly oriented toward a more self-directed learning model than past summer programs. The perceived value of the summer training experiences of 1971 is quite high among the participants as compared to other years. These finding are suggestive that when training experiences are directed toward relasing the students' potential (through participation, involvement, independence, expressing needs and interests, developing their own resources, and using the resources of others) the outcomes are perceived as highly beneficial by the participants.[1]

---

1. Kathy Gaus - Woolen, "Evaluation of the FTPP Summer Training Program - 1971" Feb, 1972, mimeo, p 12.

As well as moving toward the goal of participant satisfaction, it is clear from the content of the summer programs that they did in fact move toward the emphasis of the conceptual model. And it is also true that each program also moved toward a resolution of problems areas in cadre life that became apparent in the previous program. Chapter 2 lists the set of issues that we became aware of as the program developed and shows how they were resolved by dealing with them through anticipation with the next set of cadres to be trained. All three of these developmental changes were to a great degree the results of the interaction between staff and research staff as the ensuing summer program was planned.

The anticipated outcome of such a program model is each group and individual prepared and able to "do its own thing." The goal is the development of a training program that will accomplish this end. And what is exported by the program is not the products of the individuals or groups, but rather the structure and process that will allow other training programs to have individuals and groups develop their own personalized and individualistic products which are responsive to their particular sense of what is wrong in the situation and what needs to be changed to make it better. This is essentially what the Ford Training and Placement Program was trying to do, and it was successful in doing it as is shown by growing participant satisfaction, the resolution of cadre developmental issues, and the progress toward the conceptual model. If other colleges and universities were to try to duplicate the kind of thing that we did, I believe that there is enough information in this book to allow them to do so with considerable accuracy. And I believe that if they do so they will get very much the same kind of results that we did -- the development by groups and individuals of highly personalized solutions to the problems and situations which they identify as most important in their work.

While the program was, then, generally satisfactory in its preparation of learners to fulfill the training model, there were several major weaknesses in the training program that were never adequately overcome. At the most general level, most of these weaknesses can be umbrellaed by a sense of ambiguity and lack of specificity and rigor and descriptive detail about just what was going to happen and just exactly why. It is my opinion that the program was growing toward such definition and that another year of work might have overcome many of the problems that can fit under this general umbrella.

Evaluation was limited to affective measures of participants' satisfaction. While these are certainly important, they are not enough. Now the relationship of the form of evaluation to the specificity of the program is one of mutual cause and effect. If the program has not defined specific training goals then the research staff can not measure them. But if the research staff does not measure achievement, then the program staff can not know how well it was doing. This is not meant to establish a false delimma, but rather to point out that the development of a program is a kind of bootstrapping operation in which research grows in specificity and adequacy as the program does so. The omission is the mutual responsibility of the program staff and the research staff.

Since the instructors served as guides to a process rather than as teachers of the process, when the guidance of the instructors in withdrawn, the individuals and groups can be expected to regress because they have not learned how to direct themsleves. This was not often the case. Although several cadres did backslide or degenerate during their placement year, enough of them continued actively to suggest that somehow the skills and the impetus of the program were being somehow transferred from the instructors to the cadre members. However, if we are to judge the training program in terms of the implicit model of learner self-direction and self-development, then it seems clear that a major criticism of the program must be that in many cases the skills of leadership and self-direction were not adequately transferred from the instructors to the cadre members, and that more effort needed to be made in assuring this kind of thing happening. On the other hand this conclusion can be qualified in so far as individuals were not expected to learn all of the necessary skills to resolve problems, but were rather to learn how to gather together the necessary resources to do so. It might be possible, then, for the cadre group to evidence its self direction by continued use of the kinds of resources that the program had previously made available.

In the same manner, the program was never adequately integrated. That is, the various parts of each and every summer program seemed more in conflict with each other than parts of a unified and cohesive thrust that the learner could integrate in his efforts to improve education. I say,"in the same manner" because if the model of the program is one of a smorgasboard of resources which we were only providing a taste of, then the program in this respect did

not have a weakness. But it is my sense of the thing that somehow the learner should have come to see the various parts of the program as integral parts of a total structure that was necessary to absorb before the effort would be completely successful

Another problem that was never overcome was the problem of sequencing the various aspects of instruction and the different goals of the program in such a way that they were part of a smooth flow in which the mastery of one step led to the next task. Instead, it seemed as if we gave the people a little bit of everything at the same time and hoped that each individual and each cadre would grow a little bit in each area all of the time so that by the end of their experience they would have a sophistication in each of the areas of training and goals of the program and would be able to synthesize and integrate them. While such a hope might be rationalized as an ideal and a kind of natural growth way of developing, still, it seems to me that as instructors we might have done more to make the process of development easy by studying the nature of sequencing so that the participants and the cadres would not be overwhelmed by having too many things to think about at once.

Finally, there is a much more specific weakness. Every aspect of the training, save micro-teaching (which was finally dropped from the program) was at least one step removed from the classroom. Although the staff talked much about affecting the nature of what went on in the classroom and getting people to perceive each other as assistance and support in solving classroom problems, there was never a concentrated thrust on getting people to observe each other in practice and to help each other in improving practice in the classroom. Participants seemed to resist attempts on the part of staff to get them to interact in the classroom setting and assist each other in solving classroom. If a program is to be directed at teacher training, it seems imperative that it deal with the basic concept of a supportive group overcoming isolation in the setting of most importance to education -- the classroom itself

Recommendations for Replication

We have just mentioned several areas of inadequacy in the summer program--ambiguity, evaluation, transfer of leadership skills, integration, sequencing, and distance from classroom practice. In spite of these, the training seems to have been relatively successful. Consequently, it seems most appropriate

to maintain the general model of training and the five major segment of the summer program -- the goals of the program, Black perspectives, cross-role training, competency, and group development -- while changing the work within this framework to overcome the inadequacies.

The major change that is necessary is one that will simplify and integrate the program. To accomplish this requires a change in focus and sequencing. The first segment of the summer program -- the goals of the program -- should make a clear statement of the single focus that would dominate the program -- the process of problem solving and its components of problem identification, problem analysis, and problem resolution. This single dominant focus would have two chronological stages. First, focus on the individual in problem solving and second, focus on the group in problem solving. The first stage of focus on the individual would occupy the cadre throughout the summer program and through Christmas of the intern year. The second stage would occupy the remainder of the intern year, the following summer, and the placement year. We will return to consideration of this second stage in the next section of this chapter. Here we will deal only with the summer training program.

Black Perspectives would remain the same as it had been, devoted to providing frameworks for thinking about the nature of the problem and the kinds of solutions that would address it.

The other three segments of the summer program -- cross-role training, classroom competence, and cadre group process -- would each develop their appropriate skills for the participants, but by dealing with the specific problems that individuals bring to these segments of instruction. Each of these segments would be considered an instructional segment in a particular approach to helping individuals solve their problems. Classroom competency would be under the direction of the methods instructor. Each member of a subject matter or grade level group would present a problem to the group, and the group would take each of these in turn and develop a solution for it. The goal of each participant would be to understand the methods by which the pedagory of the subject area solves problems. Cross-role training would be under the direction of the program staff. Again each participant would address a problem to the group, and the success of each role group would be determined by their ability to aid in the solution of the problem. The group development or cadre activities

would be under the direction of the process consultant and would have the same task and the same criterion for success: Can the group bring its resources to bear on the solution of individuals problems?

Focusing the attention of these instructional segments on individual problems would not change the essential nature of the instruction. The classroom competency groups would still be working on teaching skills and the development of curriculum. The cross-role training would still be focused on the definition of roles and their interactions in the school. The cadre group development sessions would still be focused on the nature of group process and the use of the resources of the group to solve problems. What the focus would do is to reduce the ambiguity of the program and integrate all of the activities into a more easily understandable whole. It would also have other advantages.

Focusing on individual problems rather than group problems would keep the cadres from getting into "school improvement" projects and bring them closer to concentration on the specifics of what they do day to day in the school. This focus of attention should serve to bring the program closer to its goal of attention to the classroom. Getting individuals to cooperate on solving individual problems would also create the kind of atmosphere of individuals working together which might help teachers overcome the threateningness of visiting each others' classrooms.

Evaluation would be easier in the sense that there would be the practical and specific solutions to problems offered by the groups for judgement. Rather than vague goals, each group could evaluate itself and be evaluated by others in terms of the specifics of the case studies of problem solution that they had dealt with in their training. In addition, such evaluation would not be limited to the affective, but would include cognitive and behavioral information from which to make judgements about the success of the training program.

The single change of emphasis to individual problems during the summer training program could conceivably overcome all of the criticisms that we have made of the summer program. But when, then, would the cadre learn to deal with group problems? To answer that question, we turn to the third stage of training, the internship year of the program.

STAGE III: THE INTERN YEAR AND THE DEMONSTRATION OF INTERACTION

The first stage of training took place in the academic programs of the

university with the emphasis on focused preparation. The second stage of training took place in the summer training program with the emphasis on coordinated preparation. The third stage of training took place during the internship year with the emphasis on interaction of the various components of the program.

The concept of a demonstration school that is developed in the conceptual model never became a reality. (see Chapter 2 for a discussion of the reasons.) But in the internship year the cadres did integrate the focused preparation and coordinated preparation which had preceded the intership year. The internship year involved all of the components of the program -- University faculty, FTPP staff, community, students, school staff, and cadre members -- in the projects that the cadre members developed to improve the education of children.

SETTINGS FOR TRAINING IN THE INTERNSHIP YEAR

Cadres met weekly throughout the internship year. The function of the meetings was to define the problems that it wished to attack, to organize for action on those problems, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the course of action that they had taken. Group process training, directed by the process consultant, took place in this setting. This training, as in the summer program, was not devoted to a systematic attempt to make the cadre members experts in group process, but rather to help them solve problems of group process as they emerged. The members of the group also gained experience with the processes of problem identification, defining approaches to problems, carrying out action in concert, and evaluating results.

Cross cadre training took place once a month for four hours on a Saturday morning at the University. Although this program went through the same kinds of changes in shape and function as did the summer training program, it is sufficient here to describe the nature of the training as it occurred in the last operational year of the program. The three cadres in their internship year were required to attend; members of cadres which had completed their internship year were invited to attend. At the first meeting, the cadres met to review their goals for the year. Then each individual member of each cadre specified two or three major problems that he would like to work on for himself that were congruent with the goals of his cadre. All the members of all the cadres then assembled and described the kinds of problems that they would like to undertake work on as individuals. The topics of study that were of interest to more

than one person were posted around the walls of the very large room in which we were meeting, and people moved from area to area to talk with the people who were at that area to see if the goals of the individuals truly coincided. When such a coincidence was present, the people stayed at the position as the nucleus of the group. People continued to "mill around" until nearly all had found themselves a group that they wanted to participate in. These people then sat down in their groups to formulate a statement of objects, steps necessary to the achievement of the objectives, resources required to reach the objectives (financial, time, and people resources) and a timetable for completion. As they were doing this, the people who had not found a satisfactory group sat down individually with staff members to determine what they would do.

The results of this procedure were given to the staff secretary who dittoed them all and distributed them to all the members of all of the cadres prior to the second cross cadre meeting. At that meeting, the process was repeated to assure that people were making real choices and not getting backed into things that they really didn't want to do. The final participants lists were formulated, University resource people were there to begin meeting with the group, and a revised time schedule for the reporting of the group to the entire cross cadre group was set. The first meeting was held in the month of September; the reports were scattered from January through June. The groups ranged in size from one to seventeen; they ranged in composition from all being members of the same cadre to membership representing four cadres. The group topics selected during the 1971-72 school year included, among others, community involvement, jobs for teens, computer programing, curriculum through visuals, analytic thinking, the open classroom and education for the mentally handicapped.

A third setting for training was the small group. Some such groups were concerned with the development of curriculum at the school, and had the support and advice of a curriculum methods professor from the University. Very often these curriculum improvement efforts grew from the discontent of the cadre members in a particular subject matter area but grew to include all of the members of the subject matter department at the school. So in this case, quite frequently methods professors were working with teachers at the school who were not members of the cadre and who had no affiliation or relationship with the University of Chicago other than this curriculum work. Other small groups focused outward

toward the community and involved community people and school students in their efforts through various projects to improve education at their school.

Another setting for training was the continuation of formal course work at the University. Very often this took the form of work with the subject matter methods teacher, particularly in the form of the Masters' Thesis. But it also included credit for work on other projects growing from other training settings of the internship year.

All of these training settings were well integrated. The cadre meetings served as a ground for making decisons about the activities of individuals that would be most helpful to the members of the group as a whole. The work in cross cadre meetings gave cadre members a forum in which to pursue either cadre goals or individual goal. The small group work brought university professors, community people, and students in to the effort, and assisted the cadres in their endeavors at the school. The course work integrated the University structure by giving credit for these efforts. All this interaction developed from and centered on the cadres's efforts to improve education at their school.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF INTERACTION

The development of the cadre groups during the internship year is detailed in Chapter 8, and the kind of work that they produced is detailed in Chapter 9. The only purpose of mentioning examples of cadre work which are developed more fully in other places, is to show by example that the training during the cadre intern year was, in fact, based on the interaction of the various groups associated with the Ford Training and Placement Program.

In the DuSable cadre, there were two English teachers -- one young white male intern and one Black female teacher just two years from retirement. They talked together about the possibilities of making the curriculum more relevant to Black students and just what that would mean. They got the English Department to agree to a meeting with the English methods professor from the University. Since the results of that meeting were positive, the group decided to pursue a project. They brought representative students into the group and with Methods professor, teachers, and students participating, developed a unit of study at each of the four grade levels of the school which emphasized Black authors and the Black experience. They submitted their plans to the Ford Program and their principal (who was a cadre member). The necessary materials were purchased after the Ford Program and the Board of Education had agreed to

split their cost. The intern used the experience as the basis for his Master's Thesis. Involved were interns, experienced teachers, the principal, students of four grade levels. The methods professor, and the institutions of the Ford Program and the Board of Education.

At Horace Mann Elementary, some of the parents were telling teachers that they were disturbed about discipline problems which occurred when the children were on the way to or from school. Although at first the teachers did not pay much attention to this problem, the community representative in the cadre urged the importance of the matter. Teachers and principal then began to talk about the discipline problems within the school, and it was agreed that the problem was a very general one that was interferring with the relationship between parents and teachers, the students' morale, and the work of the classroom. They called upon the Ford Training and Placement Program Community Liaision (see Chapter 4 pp.____-____)staff member to make suggestions about what they might do to attack the problem. He suggested contacting more parents, and that was done. The resulting extended cadre decided to work through the PTA and at the next meeting of that group, the cadre and the PTA agreed to develop plans for a school wide workshop on discipline. The cadre group process consultant and the program Community Liaison took responsibility for designing the introductory sessions of the work shop and for structuring the remainder of it. The Ford program supplied the money for mailing costs; the Board of Education paid for the building permits. The resulting two day workshop turned out to be only the beginning of a continuing series of meetings and committee groups which continued throughout the year to attack the problem that they had identified. Out of these efforts grew a community-teacher governing board which the cadre, the staff, the community, and the principal legitimated with decision-making power before the Chicago Board of Education established its policy of having community councils.

At Hyde Park High School, the reading consultant intern organized a study group with a group of English teachers. With the advice and direction of the Reading Professor who was teaching her course, she instructed the teachers in the diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties. She assisted the teachers in their instruction and used a standardized test for pre and post testing which showed large gains. The project was accepted as a major paper for her course in reading.

In the cross cadre meetings, a member of the University's computer center staff instructed a small group of cadre teachers in the use of computers for automatic scoring of standardized tests. One of the University's public relations staff assisted the King cadre in designing a commemorative booklet and planning ad solicitation for the dedication ceremony of their new building.

These brief examples emphasize the interaction of various groups of people in the cadre activities of the internship year. They show that this intern year of training was in many cases successful in creating the desired interaction in accomplishing cadre goals and creating an interface among University, school, Board of Education, school community, and program staff.

INADEQUACIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As has been noted in the discussion of the previous stage of training, most training was one step removed from the classroom. The program was not successful in getting the appropriate interaction to take place around the classroom and its evaluation and improvement.

For the cadres to become autonomous centers of interaction for the improvement of education, they had to learn not only to become independent in gathering together the necessary human resources for their projects. They also had to become independent in their ability to get the needed financial resources. No cadre was ever successful at doing so. Throughout the life of the cadres (and one has been in operation for a total of five years) the cadres have relied on the Ford program and the Board of Education for financial support. Projects which required funding that the cadres could not get from these sources were not put into operation.

The efforts that were made to evaluate cadre projects were extremely variable. The process of evaluation is one in which teachers are not well prepared, and it should be expected that the cadres have a great deal of growing to do concerning evaluation, Also, it is clear that not every cadre project deserves the same kind or the same level of evaluation effort. Yet, in spite of these qualifications, it would have been productive for both the cadres and the program if greater attention had been paid to the learning and application of methods of evaluation to the cadre projects that were undertaken. With the large research staff that was available in the program, such an effort would not have been an exceptional strain on either cadres or staff.

There has been no conceptualization of how a cadre should end. Consequently, every cadre which has ceased operation has done so under the cloud of feeling that they shouldn't have, and that they had in some way failed. This, of course, may be true. But it is clear that cadres are not going to and should not be expected to exist in perpetuity. There needs to be some conceptualization of appropriate ways, times, and conditions, for the cadre to come to an end that is satisfying to the participants.

The kind of interaction that has been described was extremely variable from cadre to cadre. While it is one of the critieria by which a cadre can be evaluated, it is difficult to see whether the interaction activities were the cause or effect of successful cadre functioning. In either case, there is no clear conceptualization of the forces that make for successful interaction and those which impede it, except at the most generalized level. This aspect of cadre operation needs considerably more analysis and investigation to discover exactly how it is related to other aspects of cadre traing and operation.

Now, what should be done about these inadequacies? For the internship year, the time through Christmas vacation should be taken with the continuation of the approach used in the summer -- that is, dealing with the resolution of problems presented to the cadre group by the individuals who are members of it.

After the Christmas break, the cadres would then turn their major attention to the resolution of problems identified by the group rather than by individuals. The sequence here would be the process of problem identification and the identification of needed resources during the school year with the cadre members assigned specific roles to play during the summer so that all of the resources for problem solution would become available through cadre members work over the summer. The program, then, would have a second summer, but it would not be a program organized by the staff. Instead it would be a program of activity by individuals, small groups, and the cadre -- focused on getting together all of the resources necessary for attacking the identified problem in the fall of the placement year. This sequencing of activities would create a tie between the intern year and the placement year which has been lacking in past cadres. It would also allow more adequate time for the formulation and analysis of problems, including the designing of evaluation measures. This time allotment would be in contrast to the kind of schedule that cadres have had to work under in the past, and consequently might allow for a more thorough and satis-

factory result. It would allow for completing a formal presentation of the proposal and, consequently, increase the opportunities for outside funding.

Finally, during the placement year, I would recommend a series of final seminars which would evaluate the work of the cadre and define for the cadre members the ways in which the cadre should dissolve and the ways in which the mechanisms of the cadre should be incorporated into the on going social structure and problems solving processes of the school.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has discussed the three major stages of training in the Ford Training and Placement Program.-- 1) Specialist training and focused preparation, 2) Cadre Training and co-ordinated preparation, and 3) The intern year and the demonstration of interaction. Each section has included a critical analysis and suggestions for replication. Here , we will summarize by reviewing briefly the major thrust of the suggestions.

During the academic year, the major authority for training is the University and its professors. The program should extend itself to include professors who may have interests similar to the program, and should encourage them to do everything they can to make their programs flexible with alternatives which would fit into the training program. They should be encouraged to cooperate in every way possible with the program, and to take as large a part in its development as they are willing to.

During the summer training program, the major authority for training is the program staff. The program should be focused on the problems of the individual, using the major segments of training-- cross-role training, classroom competency, and cadre group development -- as different means to the end of each individual learning to work in cooperation with others in the resolution of individual problems, particularly those focused on the classroom.

During the intern year, the major authority for training is the cadre. Until Christmas, they should concentrate on the problems of individuals, only then turning to larger problems of the school. Their process should be one of interaction with all of the diverse groups associated with program, and their efforts at school improvement should extend over the summer between the intern and placement year so that the two are integrated and proposals for improvement are formalized and submitted for outside funding.

In the light of the analysis of this chapter, it seems likely that these recommendations could be carried out without extreme difficulty by a program staff, and that by doing so they would improve a pattern of training that has already shown itself to be effective in training cadres of teachers for the improvement of urban schools.